

ALWAYS LOOK ON THE BRIGHT SIDE OF DEATH
VIOLENCE, DEATH, AND SUPERNATURAL TRANSFORMATION IN OVID'S
FASTI

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

ANNA EVERETT BEEK

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

CHRISTOPHER NAPPA, ADVISER

FEBRUARY, 2015

copyright 2015 Anna Everett Beek

ABSTRACT

Ovid's *Fasti*, in its elaboration of mythic stories and the *aetia* of Roman religious practices, exhibits a marked correlation between violence and supernatural transformation: people who experience acts of intense violence such as rape, assault, and bodily mutilation are transformed by the experience into gods or other supernatural beings. In fact, within the *Fasti*, nearly all apotheoses have an episode of violence as a catalyst, and moreover nearly all violence results in transformation. Although rape (and some other forms of violence) in the *Fasti* has been examined extensively by other scholars, previous studies have focused on the perpetration of violence, while this dissertation examines the consequences of the event, how the victims fail to re-integrate to society and are removed by being ostracized, exiled, killed, transformed, or even apotheosed because a return to their former lives is impossible. Some of the prominent examples treated are Romulus, Anna Perenna, Ino, Callisto, and Lara. Special attention is paid to how this overarching pattern differentiates the *Fasti* from Ovid's best known collection of mythic transformation stories, the *Metamorphoses*. The *Metamorphoses* does provide several episodes of apotheosis (such as those of Hercules, Aeneas, Romulus, and Julius Caesar), and those episodes share certain structural elements that recur in similar episodes in the *Fasti*: in many cases, the character in question is put in life-threatening danger, which is averted at the last minute by divine intervention and transformation into divinity. Nevertheless, the *Fasti*, unlike the *Metamorphoses*, has almost no episodes of humans being transformed into plants, birds, stones, or geographic features as salvation from a threat or punishment for transgression. On the contrary, transformation is almost exclusively a vehicle to divinity or catasterism. The *Fasti*'s strong association of violence with apotheosis and vice versa enshrines violence within the Roman calendar and even celebrates it as a path to a greater destiny.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: The Hercules Model and Variations.....	13
Chapter 2: Remus and Romulus: a Divided Hercules.....	77
Chapter 3: Transformation via Rape.....	119
Chapter 4: Catasterism.....	177
Conclusion.....	209
Bibliography.....	215
Appendix: Further Transformations: Lucretia and Livia.....	225

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Apotheoses in Ovid's <i>Metamorphoses</i>	15
--	----

INTRODUCTION

Ovid and Supernatural Transformation

This dissertation is a study of narratives of supernatural transformation¹ in Ovid's *Fasti* and the common elements within them. Supernatural transformation of course plays a great part in Ovid's work, most of all in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, as Darcos states: "Ovide chante un monde, en effet, où s'opère sans cesse cette incorporation du divin sur terre."² My primary avenue of investigation will be the relationship between violence and apotheosis in Ovid's *Fasti*. There is a generally observable pattern in the *Fasti* of direct correlation between violence and supernatural transformation, to wit: supernatural transformation is necessarily precipitated by violence against the person transformed--and, for the most part, violence against a person is necessarily followed by that person's supernatural transformation. There are important deviations from this model, as I will address over the course of the dissertation, but the overwhelming trend is that Ovid's narratives of apotheosis, catasterism, and other miraculous transformations are shot through with violence, perpetrated against the person transformed. Within this correlation, the reader witnesses a martyring effect such that, to gain divine power, a

¹ Note that my investigation centers on narratives rather than predictions of apotheosis--narratives of completed events bear standard elements that predictions of the future (such as the predicted apotheoses of Augustus and Ovid at *Met.* 15.868-70 and 15.871-9, or that of Livia at *Fasti* 1.536) lack.

² Darcos (2009) 349. Tissol (2002) 310 likewise claims "the loss of human identity in metamorphosis" as one of the big themes of the *Met.*

character must first suffer some trauma as a lesser form of being; those who have not suffered on earth will not gain divine power among the gods.³

To this end, violence has a particular status and function within Augustan poetry, particularly the works of Ovid. Rea has called attention to the fact that, in the wake of the civil wars, violence was much on the mind of the Romans, and that many Augustan poets cultivated a palpable presence of violence in their poetry: “The poets’ memories of the past encouraged the Romans to explore the ways in which they could negotiate their differences of opinion about the recent violence in the city and the loss of many of their compatriots at Actium.”⁴ Ovid has a unique place in this schema, since he was the youngest of the famous Augustan poets; unlike Horace, he did not personally participate in the battles for control of the empire; unlike Vergil, his youth was not mired in civil conflict. One may see this reflected in Ovid’s work, in which violence is represented by very few large scale wars or battles with calculated political consequences at stake, and more individual attacks that are not part of an organized campaign. The violence generally occurs at the personal level, but its consequences (in the form of supernatural transformation) are greater than the audience may have expected.

³ My use of the word “martyr” is anachronistic since Ovid’s work obviously predates the Christian martyrs and their appearances in classical and post-classical literature. I use it here metaphorically to discuss characters who endure suffering in the course of mortal life, but are rewarded with exalted status in the afterlife, and are honored on earth. Although in a Christian context ideas of martyrdom are bound up with implications that the martyr is a good and righteous person suffering for his or her faith, in this context the person is only suffering, without the implications of moral goodness. For a full discussion of Christian martyrdom in the context of classical culture and literature, see Edwards (2007), especially chapter eight (“Laughing at Death?”). Edwards discusses martyrdom as an outgrowth of the idea of noble suicide. Although in some cases the Christian martyrs claim that the tortures to which they are subjected do not hurt them, in other cases the martyrs claim that “it is precisely the physical suffering of the martyr which gives value to his or her act” (Edwards 219), just as Ovid’s characters seem to experience great distress in the process of apotheosis. Calhoun (1997) persuasively discusses the parallels between Livy’s Lucretia and a Christian martyr (which will be discussed in the appendix), many of which apply to Ovid’s Lucretia as well as Lara, Remus, and Rhea Silvia.

⁴ Rea (2007) 5.

Scholarship on the *Fasti* has greatly expanded in the past twenty to thirty years. During the twentieth century, a few monumental commentaries (Frazer's work of 1929 and Bömer's work of 1958 being the most noteworthy) and a smattering of other influential works were published, but otherwise attention to the *Fasti* was minimal. Even now, the *Fasti* has not been published as an Oxford Classical Text. Starting in the eighties and nineties, renewed interest in the *Fasti* was heralded by an influx of new works such as Hinds' *The Metamorphosis of Persephone*, Barchiesi's *Il Poeta e il Principe*, Herbert-Brown's *Ovid and the Fasti*, Newlands' *Playing with Time*, and the article collection edited by Herbert-Brown, *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*.⁵ Several important commentaries on individual books of the *Fasti* have been published in recent years, with the most recent ones (Robinson's 2011 commentary on book 2 and Ursini's 2008 commentary on book 3) being the most thorough and expansive. This new flood of scholarship has addressed topics such as the dialogue between the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*'s importance as a distinct work, the political background to the *Fasti* and Ovid's thoughts on contemporary politics (primarily as expressed by using Romulus or Aeneas as a symbolic Augustus), the use of the calendar as a frame for legendary stories, and the role of silence in the punishments that the gods send to mortals. The study of silence, violence, and divine punishment--notably Murgatroyd's book *Mythical and Legendary Narrative in Ovid's Fasti* and Feeney's article "*Si licet et fas est*"--has been highly influential on this dissertation. Although previous work (such as Murgatroyd's book) tends to focus on the perpetration of violence, my dissertation examines the consequences of the event, how the victims fail to re-integrate to society and are removed by being ostracized, exiled, killed, transformed,

⁵ Also worthy of note is the 1992 volume of *Arethusa* dedicated exclusively to research on the *Fasti*.

or even apotheosed because a return to their former lives is impossible. Additionally, while other works have focused on specific types of violence (such as rape), my dissertation will focus on violence as a general phenomenon (as Segal does in his article “Ovid’s Metamorphic Bodies: Art, Gender, and Violence in the ‘Metamorphoses’”).

Although the *Fasti* is often read in concert with the *Metamorphoses*, the model I use is distinct from the narrative patterns of apotheosis shown in that poem. In many ways, the *Fasti* is a complement to the *Metamorphoses*; while the *Metamorphoses* is largely a collection of primarily Greek tales (stories of Pomona, Aeneas, Numa, and the Tiber temple of Aesculapius notwithstanding), the *Fasti*, explicating as it does the Roman calendar, digs into Italian myth with an interest unmatched in the *Metamorphoses*. The *Nachleben* of the *Metamorphoses* is felt throughout the *Fasti*: Ovid relates many of the same stories in both works, and his process of describing history as a series of changes has cast its methodological shadow across the narrative flow of the *Fasti*. Yet, as we remember from the *Metamorphoses*, *omnia mutantur*: the process has shifted for this later work, and the stories do not develop in the same way they did before. Each story under examination in this dissertation will be contrasted against the parallel stories, or similar stories, in the *Metamorphoses* and other predecessors, and in each case we will see that the overarching patterns of violence in the *Fasti* tend to steamroll the narrative arc as it is presented in other works, and supplant other traditional details.

One feature that significantly sets the *Fasti* apart from the *Metamorphoses* is that the *Fasti* contains no stories of people who are turned into plants, rocks, animals, or geographic features, whether to punish them for offending the gods, to prevent an attack, or for other reasons. In the *Fasti*, nearly all the supernatural transformations are

transformations from mortal to god, or from minor divinity into more powerful divinity.⁶ This comes as a particular surprise because the two works run parallel in so many ways; many of the stories that appear in the *Metamorphoses* are also related in the *Fasti* with variable degrees of change made between the two versions; as Alessandro Barchiesi notes: “We know that the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* are connected by a common programme, and that the composition of the two works was in a large part simultaneous and interwoven.”⁷ Although many of the apotheoses that were related in the *Metamorphoses* are reiterated in the *Fasti* (those of, for example, Ino, Callisto, Aesculapius, Hippolytus, and Romulus), the metamorphoses that are not apotheoses rarely transfer across.⁸ Apotheosis is a narrative focus in the *Fasti* as metamorphosis broadly is not, and this filtering of material sets the *Fasti* apart from the *Metamorphoses* in subject matter while foregrounding mortal contact with the divine within the narrative. In consequence, the gods are more instrumental in the transformations that occur--there are fewer spontaneous transformations with no agent named. Moreover, although many mortals in the *Metamorphoses* suffer punitive transformation as the result of their

⁶ The only exception is Callisto, who is transformed into a bear before she is transformed into a constellation. Although catasterism generally seems to represent an improvement in universal status, the connotations of catasterism are vague and not necessarily positive; see chapter four. As in my previous publication (Beek (forthcoming)), in this dissertation I will refer to the process of supernatural transformation from a mortal into a god, or from a minor divinity into a more powerful divinity, as “promotion.” For a defense of the value judgment implicit in this term (i.e., the notion that it is better to be a god than a mortal), please see chapter four.

⁷ Barchiesi (1991) 6.

⁸ Segal (1998) discusses the transformations in the *Met.* of humans into animal or inanimate forms, and his conclusions rarely are transferrable to the *Fasti*. If the *Met.* is, as he says, an environment in which “boundaries between humans and animals are dangerously fluid” and “reason and order decompose into frightening confusion and chaos” (Segal 10), the *Fasti* is a more ordered world, in which nearly all transformation is promotion to the divine and humans are little threatened by the possibility of collapse into a bestial form. Instead they are favored with the possibility of transformation into divinity--though this transformation may not come easily.

transgressions, there are very few punitive transformations in the *Fasti*.⁹ One can see that the two works have divergent lines of interest insofar as the *Metamorphoses* might show perpetrators of violence transformed into rocks or trees, whereas the *Fasti* might show victims of violence transformed into divine figures.

In studying patterns of violence in the *Fasti*, it becomes clear that the violent episodes, particularly in conjunction with supernatural transformation, generally follow one of several narrative models, and for this dissertation I have organized and examined the episodes accordingly. In chapter one I have outlined the apotheoses in the *Metamorphoses* and discussed how these stories set expectations for the apotheoses in the *Fasti*, in a model I call the Hercules model. In this model a character is threatened with mortal danger, which is averted at the last minute: the character is saved from the danger by means of divine transformation. In this case the violence itself is not the transformative aspect, but rather the threat of violence is. This is followed by an examination of some of the *Fasti*'s apotheoses that most closely adhere to this model and a discussion of how they vary from it. Romulus and Remus constitute a special case of this model, and they are examined together in chapter two: in their case, Romulus is apotheosed without being threatened by violence, but Remus suffers a brutal murder as a surrogate. In chapter three I discuss a different model, in which a female character falls victim to rape by a male god and is transformed by the experience. As if in compensation for the violence she suffers, she is promoted to immortality, granted augmented powers, divine authority, or status among the gods. Finally, chapter four examines catasterism, which has its own complications and variations as a category of apotheosis, and, although

⁹ Callisto's transformation into a bear is presented as punitive, and the catasterism of the Raven, the Snake, and the Bowl is specified as a punishment for duplicity.

frequently associated with violence, does not necessarily adhere to a set narrative model.

In the appendix I will discuss how some of the characters in the *Fasti* seem themselves to be aware of these narrative models and attempt to invoke them to effect apotheosis stories in their own reality, although the text provides little evidence that their efforts were successful.

There is an important point to be made about apotheosis as a religious phenomenon, namely that no ethical judgment is necessarily attached to any of the apotheosed figures. While it may be plausible to believe that Romulus, for example, was deemed worthy of apotheosis by the gods on account of his exalted heritage and extraordinary service to the state, in fact Ovid in the *Fasti* usually declines to specify a reason why any given character was apotheosed. As represented in the poems, gods may ostentatiously advocate for a mortal's apotheosis,¹⁰ but--excepting the cases of five figures in the *Metamorphoses* who have significance in Roman state cult--the reasons for their advocacy are not eloquently explained.¹¹ Although a martyrizing effect is observable insofar as characters generally suffer before their divine transformations, there is no explicit acknowledgement that suffering is a cause of transformation, any more than any other possible catalyst. Likewise there is no judgment that any given character is good or bad, deserving or undeserving of apotheosis; as described by the author, it is merely a fact of fate.

¹⁰ Mars' advocacy on behalf of Romulus is the best example of this phenomenon in the *Fasti*; see chapter two.

¹¹ Pandey (2013) 422-3 touches on the reasons why a person might be apotheosed, but not in a terribly systematic way; for the most part, Pandey discusses the Stoic views on immortality and discusses this as if this is the only means to immortality that a philosophical (that is, educated) Roman might imagine. Pandey does, however, discuss the distinction between people who are apotheosed based on their lineage and those who are apotheosed for their own works, and notes the significance of this model for Augustan poets.

A final point to be addressed is the unfinished state of the *Fasti*. Whether or not one accepts Ovid's (not entirely certain) assertion that he composed twelve books of *Fasti*,¹² there is a general agreement that the six existing books are incomplete and that Ovid would have further revised the work before publication. In assessing the *Fasti*, I would follow Green, who argues that Ovid wrote an initial draft before his exile, left the work aside for a number of years, then accomplished sundry revisions after the death of Augustus, ultimately leaving the work incomplete.¹³ The unfinished nature of this work makes it difficult to approach as a whole, polished, and sequential work of literature.¹⁴ It is clear that in certain places Ovid develops an overarching theme to link a number of sequential episodes,¹⁵ throwing stress on the calendar progression of relevant stories; it is clear also that certain transitions are rough or jarring and demonstrate little obvious link between adjacent stories. The fact that the work is obviously not in finished form makes it rather artificial to discuss it as if it were in finished form, for which reason I will not be stressing the sequential nature of the work in my discussion, but rather will be (for the most part) dealing with the work as a collection of non-sequential stories. At certain times, particularly in the discussion of catasterisms, the sequential aspect of the work becomes inescapably important, and in those cases I will address the aspect, but for the most part I prefer to leave it aside.

¹² *Tr.* 2.549. Cf. Newlands (1995) 4-5, 124-30, 209-36.

¹³ Green's commentary on *Fasti* 1 (2004) 15-23, cf. Robinson (2011) appendix I, or Johnson (1978).

¹⁴ Newlands (2000) 174 has well addressed this point: "The lack of a coherent plot in this asymmetrical, boldly discontinuous poem makes it possible to read--and reread--the *Fasti* not only with varying emphasis but in different directions, backwards as well as forwards...such a way of reading can be open to the relational rather than the sequential patterns formed in the text through repetitions, juxtapositions, thematic variations."

¹⁵ In a particularly clear example, Robinson (2011) s.v. 2.19-34 identifies the month of February as shaded with themes of pollution and purgation.

The State and Time: Interpretive Questions

Much has been written on the Roman quest to control time, all the attempts to align the politico-social calendar to the religious calendar to the lunisolar calendar and the agricultural cycles. From Julius Caesar's calendrical reforms to the renaming of months after political figures, from the visibility of time on the monumental scale of Augustus' horologium to the small and practical scale of inscribed fasti, time loomed large in the Augustan world. The reconciliation of natural time with the calendar of events that Romans wished to observe was an important issue in the Augustan age, as investigated by Feeney in his book *Caesar's Calendar*.¹⁶ Ovid's *Fasti* engages this same interest in time and the same wish to reconcile astronomy with human practice.

Among the works of Ovid, the *Fasti* is often criticized for its lack of flow. While the *Metamorphoses* transitions smoothly from story to story and weaves an immense corpus of legend and history into one chronologically-organized narrative, the *Fasti* shudders from one story to another with awkward or nonexistent transitions. The order of and connections between stories, I would argue, is not poorly-considered or unfinished; on the contrary, the order of the stories is paramount. The stories are in fact arranged in chronological order, but not the chronological order in which they occurred (as in the *Metamorphoses*), rather, in the ritual chronological order in which they are observed and commemorated by contemporary Romans. To that end, in a large part this work describes the experience of living Roman religion as Ovid's audience knew it, and implicitly invited his audience to compare the account given in the *Fasti* to their own personal experience. Of course any literary work invites interpretation and critical engagement

¹⁶ Cf. Newlands (1995) 11-2, 22-5.

from the audience, but perhaps more than any other work of Ovid, the *Fasti* invites the readers to independently evaluate the information presented, to think critically about what narratives Ovid relates and why he narrates them with the given details and in the given context.

The implications are most significant insofar as the reader can perceive the events of the text as being pulled into the present, or the present and the narrative time as coexisting in a timeless realm. This perception of time has been discussed by Barchiesi in *The Poet and the Prince* in the context of the biography of Romulus:¹⁷ in the *Fasti*, the reader is able to find an account of nearly all the major life events of Romulus, although confusion may arise from the fact that these events are narrated in what seems to be a deliberately jumbled narrative order. In this situation, the reader is not meant to be held in suspense regarding the events of Romulus' life; usually, the reader may take for granted Romulus' biography as read in Livy or other historians (but the details will be discussed as they arise throughout this dissertation). Romulus will, rest assured, be fathered by Mars, born from Rhea Silvia, exposed on the Tiber, nursed by the wolf, and so forth. Given the non-linear order of the narrative, the reader, presumably already familiar with Romulus' *vita*, is invited to import his or her existing knowledge about the founder, make comparisons to the accounts of Livy or Ennius, and overlay his or her own experience of commemorations of the events described. In short, the piecing-together of Romulus' biography over the course of the *Fasti* invites piecing together knowledge of Romulus from all sorts of external sources, insofar as the biography is not neatly laid out as a cohesive narrative, and the readers are invited to participate in the process of constructing

¹⁷ Barchiesi (1997) 154-5, although Barchiesi's discussion centers on Romulus' importance to the *Fasti* more than the importance of the order (or deliberate non-order) of the events of Romulus' life.

the meaning of Romulus beyond what they are told in any given episode. This aspect takes on added significance when a story in the *Fasti* substantially diverges from an established narrative in, for example, the *Metamorphoses*. One can see such divergences in Ino's story: in the *Metamorphoses*, Ino in the middle of a crisis leaps from a cliff and is apotheosed by Neptune, who consequently cuts short her suffering. In the *Fasti*, Ino likewise leaps off the cliff, but her crisis continues through further trials before she reaches apotheosis. Ovid's correction of his own account invites comparison between the two, suggests that one is less truthful than the other (or at least that they have been deliberately told in different ways to illustrate different points), and invites the reader's judgment of what should be believed and why. Interpretation is a crucial aspect of reading the *Fasti*, and this aspect becomes even more pronounced when Ovid discusses events from living memory, such as the death of Julius Caesar, for which the reader might have autoptic evidence (or trusted secondhand evidence).

In discussing the interpretation of the *Fasti*, and all of Ovid's oeuvre, I find Robinson's model of the "supportive" reader versus the "suspicious" reader valuable.¹⁸ There is unending debate over Ovid's precise political attitude toward the rule of Augustus, Livia, and Tiberius, the degree of sincerity the poet felt in his effusive praise of the sovereigns, and the degree of sarcasm or irony he exercised in praising them. According to Robinson's model, one need not fix any inflexible interpretation to Ovid's comments on contemporary politics. Robinson sees Ovid take advantage of the inherent ambiguity of his statements, and allows multiple interpretations: the supportive reader may uncritically observe Ovid's praises of the sovereigns, but the suspicious reader is

¹⁸ Robinson (2011) 9-11. Cf. Hinds (1987b): "Ovid's texts cultivated ambiguities that could be interpreted by orthodox readers in a traditional way as praising contemporary and imperial institutions, yet be construed by dissenting readers as revealing flaws and dishonesties in the official Augustan world."

free to assume one or more layers of ironic insincerity. Once again, control over the meaning of Ovid's work rests on individual interpretation. Even so, this seems a dangerous game for Ovid to have been playing (what reader could have been more suspicious than Augustus, the one who was responsible for Ovid's exile in the first place?). If Ovid was writing with the intent that readers should project their own vision of Ovid's politics onto the work, it was not necessarily a wise decision for Ovid to provide room for Augustus to search out subversive readings in the text and provide a pretext to leave Ovid in exile.

CHAPTER 1

THE HERCULES MODEL AND VARIATIONS

The *Metamorphoses* is an essential element in the background to the *Fasti*.¹ Its wide scope of mythic stories of all sorts, particularly transformation stories, provides abundant comparisons to other works of Ovid. Since the *Fasti* is for the most part a collection of legendary stories, the comparisons to the *Metamorphoses* are particularly relevant. In fact, several apotheosis narratives from the *Metamorphoses* are entirely re-narrated in the *Fasti*, including those of Callisto, Ino, Persephone, Romulus, and Julius Caesar. Therefore, to provide a frame of reference for the transformation narratives in the *Fasti*, I will begin by discussing the common elements of the transformation episodes in the *Metamorphoses*, which in aggregate set reader expectations for the narratives of the *Fasti*.

When comparing the many apotheosis narratives that appear in the *Metamorphoses*,² a number of recurring elements work together to establish a model for

¹ The question of whether these two works were composed concurrently, or whether the *Met.* was composed first, is difficult to answer with any certainty. The current scholarly consensus is that the two were for the most part composed concurrently, although some revisions in the *Fasti* were clearly completed well after the main body of the work was written (see Fantham (1998) 2-3). Even if the two works were composed at the same time, I am comfortable discussing the *Met.* as an influence on the *Fasti*, since the *Met.* is the paramount source for transformation narratives of all sorts.

² I define an apotheosis narrative as a narrative account of the process by which a mortal becomes a (non-animal) divine figure, or a low-level divinity becomes a more powerful divinity. Within the *Metamorphoses* I include Io (1.728-47), Callisto and Arcas (2.496-531), Ino and Melicertes (4.512-42), Persephone (5.385-571), Hercules (9.159-272), Acis (13.870-97), Glaucus (13.917-63), Aeneas (14.581-

such episodes, and this model established in the *Metamorphoses* carries over and can be used as a point of comparison for apotheosis narratives in the *Fasti*. This model is frequently examined in a set of four major apotheosed mortals who have significance in Roman cult and politics, those being Hercules, Aeneas, Romulus, and Julius Caesar.³ I will be focusing on these apotheoses, along with that of Hersilie, in my analysis of the apotheoses in the *Metamorphoses*. The primary criterion linking these passages is the extended narrative and depth of detail devoted to the process of apotheosis. Further, in most cases the mortal is threatened with deadly violence and is in danger of dying. In consequence, the danger attracts the attention of a god (usually a powerful Olympian) to advocate for the mortal's apotheosis, and the mortal is thus diverted from death to immortality.⁴ The five major apotheoses are set apart not only by the political significance of the apotheosed characters, but also because of the stress the sponsoring gods place on the fact that these characters deserve apotheosis.⁵ After having read the

608), Romulus (14.805-28), Hersilie (14.829-51), Virbius (15.497-546), and Julius Caesar (15.745-851). I exclude anyone who is transformed into any sort of animal, even if implied to be divine (such as Cadmus and Harmonia), and anyone whose process of apotheosis is implied or predicted but not narrated (such as Aesculapius, Augustus, or Ovid).

³ Galinsky (1972) 157: "The account of Herakles' apotheosis [in the *Met.*] serves to anticipate the deifications of Romulus, Aeneas, and Julius Caesar in the final books of the *Metamorphoses*." Tissol (2002) 311: "Ovid presents a parade of heroes in the later books of the *Metamorphoses*. Hercules leads the way in Book 9, then Aeneas, Romulus, Julius Caesar, and Augustus form a sequence of apotheosed mortals." Ibid. 327: "The apotheosis of Hercules in Book 9 establishes a pattern that is reinforced strongly by the apotheoses of Romulus and of Julius Caesar's soul." Kenney (2011) s.v. 9.241: "Ercole è implicitamente riconosciuto come un prototipo di Augusto...anche Augusto, alla fine, con Romolo e Giulio Cesare, raggiungerà l'apoteosi." Solodow's (1988:191) discussion of apotheosis in the *Met.* also treats these four as if they are the only apotheoses in the *Met.* Feeney (1991) discusses five apotheoses in the *Met.* (these four plus Aesculapius). In general, scholarly discussions of apotheosis in the *Met.* consistently bypass the apotheoses of characters outside these four such as Acis, Glaucus, Ino, etc.

⁴ It is important to note here the distinction between apotheosis (an individual's transformation into a deity) and deification (recognition of this process by mortals, especially the Roman state), although others may use these terms interchangeably.

⁵ *Met.* 9.256-8: Jupiter (in persuading Juno to assent to Hercules' apotheosis) says that anyone objecting to Hercules' apotheosis still must acknowledge his worthiness (*si quis...data praemia nolet, sed meruisse dari sciet inuitusque probabit*). 14.581-2: Venus persuades the gods, even Juno, to allow Aeneas' apotheosis, and they assent on account of his *uirtus* (*deos omnes ipsamque Aeneia uirtus Iunonem ueteres finire coegerat iras*). 14.594-5: Jupiter acknowledges to Venus Aeneas' worthiness of apotheosis (*estis...caelesti*

Metamorphoses and observed the common elements of the apotheosis narratives, the audience is able to see a reliable narrative model that is often, but not invariably, repeated in the parallel apotheosis narratives in the *Fasti*. Because there are so many apotheosis narratives in the *Metamorphoses*, and their extended duration makes them difficult to quote efficiently, I will summarize the salient details in the following table.

Table 1: Apotheoses in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

Character apotheosed	Which god acts as sponsor for the apotheosis?	Is the character apotheosed to save him or her from life-threatening violence? If so, what is the threat?
Io	Jupiter	no
Callisto (and Arcas)	Jupiter	yes: Arcas is about to kill Callisto
Ino (and Melicertes)	Venus/Neptune	yes: Ino's husband is attacking her, and she has jumped off a cliff to escape
Persephone	Dis	no (but compare the rape model in chapter three)
Hercules	Jupiter	yes: poisoned shirt
Acis	Galatea	yes: crushed by a rock
Glaucus	Oceanus and Tethys	no
Aeneas	Venus	no
Romulus	Mars	no
Hersilie	Iris/Juno/Quirinus	no
Virbius	Diana	yes: dies in a chariot accident, brought back from the dead
Julius Caesar	Venus	yes: assassinated by political enemies

Finer points will be examined on a case-by-case basis in this and the following chapters. For the time being, I would note that Ovid invokes this model (imminent death

munere digni, quaequepetis pro quoque petis). 14.808-11: Mars requests that Jupiter apotheose Romulus and praises his worthiness of apotheosis (*tempus adest...praemia iam promissa mihi dignoque nepoti soluere et ablatum terris imponere caelo*). 14.833-4: Iris addresses Hersilie and deems her worthy of being the wife of a god (*matrona...dignissima...coniunx nunc esse Quirini*). When Julius Caesar is discussed, Venus and Jupiter itemize a long list of his accomplishments, all of which are implied to justify his worthiness of apotheosis. In the remaining apotheosis narratives, the question of whether the apotheosed character is worthy of apotheosis generally is not raised.

in which a god intervenes to save the mortal at risk) as a significant recurring plot element in the *Metamorphoses*, one intended to call the reader's attention with its purple drama and potential danger. The reader is invited to reflect on all the episodes of violence in the *Metamorphoses* in which no god steps in at the last minute to save mortals in danger, and to consider the special status granted to these select few and the reasons for their status. Although the correlation between violence and apotheosis is weak in the *Metamorphoses*--only in half of the apotheosis narratives is the transformation a divine intervention to save the character from death--it appears frequently enough to set expectations for the apotheoses in the *Fasti*. In the *Fasti* the correlation between violence and apotheosis is much stronger and thereby cements the role of violence as a beneficial transformative force in the *Fasti*.⁶ It is my contention that this model--I will call it the Hercules Model, after the well known passage in the *Metamorphoses*⁷--is the standard model for apotheosis in Ovid's myths, the most predictable template that an audience might expect, and it is this model therefore that Ovid so frequently subverts, plays with, and rebels against in the *Fasti*.⁸

⁶ Given this established model, one may notice the model even more pointedly when Ovid begins to suggest it, but then deviates from his own formula and defies the reader's expectations, as he does in the case of, for example, Ino in the *Fasti*.

⁷ It is difficult to generalize about the pre-Ovidian tradition of Hercules in literature, since the literary descriptions of Hercules were so sporadic, varied, and non-comprehensive. For an overview of Hercules in classical literature, see Galinsky (1972). Curley (2013) 115-21 and 161-75 discusses the influence of the tragic genre on the apotheosis of Ovid's Hercules.

⁸ The rape stories discussed in chapter three follow a different model altogether; in most of those cases (except perhaps Lara) the violence is not presented as life-threatening, and for that reason not dire enough to require apotheosis as a means for salvation from death. In those cases, unfortunate though it may seem, the violence is itself the transformative power--the transformation is not something that intervenes to protect the character from violence. For these rape victims, rape is the means to immortality, not something immortality will save them from. As evidenced by the 'martyrizing effect,' Ovid generally presents violence and suffering as inseparable from the process of apotheosis, but this will be discussed further below. Furthermore, Ovid's narratives of catasterism frequently diverge from this model, as will be described in chapter four.

The differences between the process of deification in the *Metamorphoses* as opposed to the *Fasti* have been explored by M. R. Salzman; in her article “Deification in the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*,” she concludes that there is a categorical difference between the depictions of apotheosis in the two works, to wit: “What I found...was a more explicitly positive, accepting view of all the deifications in the *Fasti*--Augustan and non-Augustan deifications alike--and a more ambivalent, ironic tone throughout the *Metamorphoses*.”⁹ There are some differences between the approach that Salzman takes to deification and that which I use; for example, Salzman limits her study very narrowly to “deification into anthropomorphic deities,” whereas my study encompasses supernatural transformations more broadly.¹⁰ Nevertheless, I do not agree that Ovid makes a systematic change in narrative style between the deifications in the *Metamorphoses* and the parallel episodes in the *Fasti*: in my opinion, Salzman is applying a procrustean analysis to these narratives that contorts the significance of the episodes.¹¹ While I am convinced that there are standard elements in most of the apotheoses in the *Metamorphoses*, which combine to outline a general model of apotheosis, this model is neither systematically followed in the *Metamorphoses*, nor systematically altered in the corresponding stories in the *Fasti*: the *Fasti* apotheosis narratives may or may not conform to the model.

An examination of Ovid’s narratives of apotheosis in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* reveals that Ovid is no aretalogist. Although Ovid writes many accounts of mortals

⁹ Salzman (1998) 319.

¹⁰ Salzman’s study does not include examination of Anna Perenna, Callisto, most of the minor catasterisms, or any of the rape stories I will examine in chapter three, so her conclusions need not necessarily be congruent with mine.

¹¹ For comparison, Murgatroyd (2005) presents a more organic approach to the parallel episodes between the *Met.* and the *Fasti* in his chapter “Ovid and Ovid.”

apotheosed, in most apotheosis narratives he does not prioritize describing the extraordinary deeds and qualities of the person apotheosed, nor explaining why any given mortal deserved to be apotheosed, nor even, in all likelihood, holding up any apotheosed mortal for veneration.¹² In fact, with a few prominent exceptions, Ovid's apotheosed mortals (as described in the texts in which they are apotheosed) seldom emerge as self-determined characters;¹³ they are essentially passive and reactive characters, experiencing and responding to the actions of the gods rather than acting on their own initiatives.¹⁴ For most of these characters, the transition from mortal to immortal is the majority of their story, at least as Ovid portrays it in his texts: for example, in the *Metamorphoses*, the audience witnesses Romulus deified, but hears little more about him.¹⁵ The gods send mortals curses or blessings, the gods agitate for their apotheoses, and the gods ultimately carry them off to the sky. Even if, for example, Julius Caesar was deemed worthy of apotheosis by virtue of his military successes and his reforms to the Roman state, the reader of the *Fasti* is given none of that context; the reader only sees Vesta's decision to

¹² Murgatroyd (2005) 175-6 notes that Livy's Romulus is treated seriously, whereas Ovid's Romulus is undermined by frivolity. Galinsky (1972) 157-60 likewise reads the apotheosis of Hercules in Ovid's *Met.* as primarily mock-heroic in tone. Nevertheless, in the *Metamorphoses*' five major political apotheoses referenced above, Ovid makes a point of stating the character's worthiness of apotheosis. Galinsky (1972) 160 for his part reads the final line of Hercules' apotheosis in the *Met.* (*omnia qui uicit, uincet quos cernitis ignes*, 9.250) as "theodicean," providing a rationale for why Hercules was apotheosed; I would maintain that Ovid here is not explaining why Hercules became divine, but only using a poetic turn of phrase to illustrate the certainty of his apotheosis.

¹³ Some Ovidian apotheosed mortals whose self-motivated exploits are narrated in a reasonable amount of detail are Hercules in the *Met.*, Ino in the *Fasti*, Romulus in the *Fasti*, and Aeneas in the *Met.* Although he is a minor character, Glaucus in the *Met.* is the hero of one adventure unrelated to his deification, and also undergoes an apotheosis that is described in detail, precipitated by his own actions, and rationalized in logical (if fantastic) terms.

¹⁴ Tissol (2002) 328: "By remythologizing history Ovid incorporates it into the world of the *Metamorphoses*, in which divinities are active and humans largely acted upon. He also opposes euhemeristic modes of interpreting the shift from mortal to divinity." Cf. Segal (1971) 378: "Ovid's figures [in the *Met.*] are victims rather than agents."

¹⁵ Tissol (2002) discusses this as a lack of context and interpretive guidance for the heroes under discussion; with so little aretalogy of these heroes presented, their heroic status can be called into question: "Historical patterns are among those that Ovid deliberately reduces to incoherence...Ovid presents his portraits, so to speak, without *titulus* and *elogium* to regulate their interpretation. Thus exposed, the portraits lose their interpretive transparency" (Tissol 311-12).

apotheose Caesar, followed by the goddess transporting Caesar to Olympus. Further, after these mortals are apotheosed, they seldom step in to influence events on earth, but rather carry on in a sort of divine seclusion. If these characters are to be held up as objects of veneration who were apotheosed for sound reasons, the reader must import an external rationale, because that information is generally omitted from Ovid's works.¹⁶ While Salzman points to this passivity as evidence of the arbitrariness underlying the practice of deification that undermines the legitimacy of the deifications,¹⁷ I am more inclined to see it as evidence of where Ovid's interest lies. In relating a book of transformations, or aetiologies of religious practices, Ovid is drawn to the moment of apotheosis as an extraordinary change in the universe--and he is content to let others worry about the more prosaic achievements of the curia and the battlefield.

So far I have described the Hercules model of apotheosis, in which a mortal faces an imminent threat to his or her life, a deity intervenes to save that mortal from the threat, and apotheosis reaches the mortal before the mortal falls victim to death. The Hercules model, I argue, is the most traditional model for Ovid's apotheosis stories and the model that Ovid's readers would expect a apotheosis story to follow. In light of this expectation, Ovid entertains his readers by playfully challenging and subverting the given model; one may witness these playful subversions occasionally in the *Metamorphoses*, and frequently in the *Fasti*. This chapter discusses several figures from the *Fasti* (Anna

¹⁶ Tissol (2002) 311 remarks that "Ovid's parade of heroes arrives accompanied by preexisting interpretive baggage," that is, Ovid's readers presumably are familiar with a preexisting tradition of any given myth and Ovid plays with and reshapes this tradition into his own narrative. My investigation is concerned with how Ovid constructs his own narrative rather than how he plays off whatever baggage we assume the heroes carried for his original readers.

¹⁷ Tissol (2002) 332 on the contrary sees the lack of deeds attributed to Romulus in the *Met.* as helpful to the founder's reputation: if Ovid declines to discuss Romulus' biography, he is not required to explain away anything that might be considered damaging: "If, as Barchiesi suggests, the violence and ruthlessness of Romulus' exploits in the *Fasti* make him a problematic parallel to Augustus, we may suppose that Ovid gives himself an easier task in the *Metamorphoses* by keeping Romulus' deeds out of his narrative."

Perenna, Julius Caesar, Ino, and Triptolemus) who in varying degrees conform to or suggest the Hercules model, and the intricate ways in which they challenge the reader's expectations. The ways in which these narratives transform the Hercules model are particularly noticeable because Julius Caesar and Ino have parallel apotheosis narratives in the *Metamorphoses*, and in the *Fasti* their stories bear distinct (though not necessarily systematic) differences.¹⁸

To begin, I will examine the hypothesis that is generally but not absolutely reliable over the extent of the *Fasti*, namely that there is a direct, causal relationship between violence and supernatural transformation: within the *Fasti*, violence is generally followed by transformation, and transformation is generally precipitated by violence. In the rape narratives examined in chapter three, this transformation manifests as *compensation for* violence suffered, but in the cases seen in this chapter, transformation appears instead as *salvation from* violence suffered. Ovid presents the stories of Anna Perenna, Julius Caesar and Ino, in which the violence threatened is averted at the last second. The fact that they are spared illustrates the idea that the transformation need not depend on actual, realized violence; the threatened violence still evokes the martyring effect. This recurring narrative motif of averted violence in the *Fasti* suggests the same phenomenon visible in Ovid's treatment of Romulus in the *Fasti*, namely that violence and death are somehow disreputable or otherwise undesirable, and that being spared from the violence that is inherent to transformation is salutary. Ovid, in fashioning these stories, makes an effort to prevent his apotheosed heroes from being contaminated with such elements.

¹⁸ Hinds (1987a) examines the generic influences that would cause Ovid to develop these pairs of stories in different ways, but beyond generic differences there is a larger scheme constructed in the *Fasti* that links violence with apotheosis almost inseparably.

The fact that the gods take such extraordinary measures to avert violence illustrates a larger pattern. One should consider the fact that, even if one last extraordinary episode of transformative violence is averted, all of these characters have a history of being victims of violence (and usually of perpetrating violence as well), and cannot be imagined to escape violence on the whole. After a history of many violent episodes, only when they are threatened with imminent death is the violence finally averted. Additionally, these characters are all known from other works of literature, in which they are ultimately subject to the final, deadly violence (whether it is described as transformative or not), and Ovid, in deliberately averting this violence, is establishing a counternarrative to correct these earlier works--but only on a few final points. In short, violence is strongly associated with these characters; Ovid's ostentatious attempts to avert or obliterate the ultimate act of violence visited upon them seem to be efforts to ameliorate the reputations of the characters transformed. Nevertheless, the substantial level of violence that remains in the narrative preserves the characters' unsavory nature. Over the course of the work, very few of these apotheosed characters appear unequivocally good or bad, no matter how much violence is presented in, or omitted from, their stories.

Anna Perenna

Anna Perenna is an extremely variable character in the *Fasti*. Three separate, extended tales are narrated in the description of the holiday associated with her, and each tale seems to present a different personality and history for the character in question, for

which reason it is challenging to read the protagonists of these stories as one consistent character. Beyond this, Anna Perenna is one of the few deities in classical literature that one might justly label a “trickster goddess,”¹⁹ given how she disguises herself and deceives other gods; one of the primary obstacles to reading her personality consistently is the fact that she is being intentionally deceptive. Moreover, since Ovid equates Anna Perenna with Vergil’s Anna from the *Aeneid*, the reader is encouraged to import the personality attributed to Anna in that influential literary predecessor, and ponder how Anna’s personality might have been affected by her transition from mortal to immortal, to say nothing of her transition from epic to didactic elegy. Her dubious internal consistency makes the endeavor of literary analysis a worthy challenge, a literary problem that invites a complex understanding of her character to see where she fits into the scheme of supernatural transformations in the *Fasti*.

I will begin with the first story Ovid tells about Anna Perenna: the account of how Dido’s sister Anna survived the political collapse of Carthage, sought refuge with Aeneas, was attacked on Lavinia’s orders and saved from this attack via apotheosis.²⁰ Anna Perenna’s apotheosis is unusual in its provocation. Unlike the vast majority of the apotheosed women in Ovid, Anna Perenna undergoes an apotheosis that is not a compensation for rape, and in fact has no apparent connection to rape.²¹ Rather, Anna

¹⁹ In this respect she may be considered to be in the company of Vergil’s Venus, Apollonius’ Aphrodite, and Ovid’s Venus from *Met.* 5.

²⁰ Littlewood (1980) 305 assumes that there is a pre-Ovidian source for Anna’s adventures but admits that this source “has yet to be discovered.” For an overview of Anna Perenna in the *Fasti*, see Brugnoli (1991), Frazer (1929) s.v. 3.523-689, Kötzle (1991) 65-72.

²¹ On the potential rape of Anna Perenna, see below.

Perenna's apotheosis is effected in order to *prevent* violence: her apotheosis saves her from the ambush that Lavinia has laid for her.²²

*omnia promittit falsumque Lavinia volnus
mente premit tacita dissimulatque metus;
donaque cum videat praeter sua lumina ferri
multa, tamen mitti clam quoque multa putat.
non habet exactum quid agat: furialiter odit,
et parat insidias et cupit ulta mori.
nox erat: ante torum visa est adstare sororis
squalenti Dido sanguinolenta coma
et 'fuge, ne dubita, maestum fuge' dicere 'tectum';
sub verbum querulas impulit aura fores.
exsilit et velox humili †super ausa† fenestra
se iacit (audacem fecerat ipse timor),
cumque metu rapitur tunica velata recincta
currit ut auditis territa damma lupis,
corniger hanc cupidis rapuisse Numicius undis
creditur et stagnis occuluisse suis.
Sidonis interea magno clamore per agros
quaeritur: apparent signa notaeque pedum;
ventum erat ad ripas: inerant vestigia ripis;
sustinuit tacitas conscius amnis aquas.
ipsa loqui visa est 'placidi sum nympa Numici:
amne perenne latens Anna Perenna vocor.'*

Lavinia agreed to everything and disguised in her silenced mind how she mistakenly perceived an affront and she hid her fear; although she saw many gifts carried before her eyes, she thought that many others were also sent in secret. She did not know exactly what to do: she hated [Anna] wrathfully, and she prepared an ambush and desired to die avenged. It was night: Dido, blood-soaked and with filthy hair, seemed to stand before her sister's bed, saying: "Flee this grim house without hesitation," and following close upon the words, a wind rattled the doors with a groan. [Anna] jumped up and, having thrown herself quickly over the low windowsill, she cast herself down (fear itself made her daring), and because she was seized by fear, she runs dressed in her girded-up tunic, just as a frightened sheep runs from wolves that she has heard, and the horned Numicius is believed to have snatched her in his desirous waves and to have hidden her in his waters. Meanwhile, the Sidonian [Anna] is sought in the fields with a great commotion, and the marks and signs of her feet are found; they came to the banks [of Numicius]: there were footprints on the banks; the knowing river smoothed his calm waters. She herself seemed to speak: "I am a

²² At *Fasti* 3.874 Ovid references (but does not elaborate) a similar story for Helle, the namesake of the Hellespont, who with her brother Phrixus flew on a golden ram, but fell off the ram into the water. According to Hyginus (*Poetica Astonomica* 2.20), Helle did not die in the fall, but was saved by Poseidon and subsequently bore him children (Helle's transformation is also related at Eratosthenes 19, where Ino is not mentioned). In relating the origin of the constellation Aries, Ovid says [*Phrixus*] *flebat...caeruleo iunctam [Hellen] nescius esse deo*. As in Anna Perenna's story, the reader encounters the trope of a mortal experiencing prolonged suffering (Helle was the victim of a wicked stepmother), experiencing the danger of death, and being saved by a god and translated to divinity.

nymph of quiet Numicius: eternally hiding by the river [*amne perenne*], I am called Anna Perenna.”²³

With this alternative rationale for apotheosis, the reader may immediately categorize Anna Perenna’s apotheosis as a salvation from life-threatening violence. Anna Perenna has already suffered considerably when she was (for the second time) driven out of her home by political upheaval, separated from her people, and forced to resettle. She finds refuge among certain people (Aeneas’ Italian city) whom she learns too late to be untrustworthy. Having been attacked and driven from her bedroom, she flees blindly into the night, and her rapture by the river Numicius prevents her death at the hands of Lavinia’s henchmen.²⁴

In Anna’s story, many aspects are mightily compressed, and suffer from the dearth of details. The interaction between Anna and Aeneas, for example, is completed very quickly: Aeneas not only does not request an explanation for Anna’s appearance in his realm, he actively urges her to refrain from telling the story of Dido’s death,²⁵ as if the details of Anna’s story were insignificant, or taken for granted.²⁶ More important, though, is the lack of elaboration over Anna’s transformation. When she flees Lavinia, she becomes a nymph. The slamming of a door gives little indication of what Lavinia’s henchmen had planned, what danger threatened Anna, or why Numicius felt it essential

²³ *Fasti* 3.633-54. Throughout this dissertation, all translations are my own work unless otherwise noted.

²⁴ There is a strong parallel between the incessantly-renewed exile of Anna, whose attempts to settle in a permanent home are constantly thwarted, and the wanderings of Io in the *Met.* (1.664-746), particularly insofar as each one seeks a permanent place of rest that forever eludes them, each is tormented by a woman who suspects them of adultery, and neither is able to remain in a set home until they are apotheosed by a god. Io never appears to be in imminent danger of death, so in contrast to Anna Perenna, her apotheosis comes as the long-awaited relief in a protracted span of suffering rather than as spontaneous relief from a sudden and unexpected threat. See below for Ovid’s mention of the possibility that Anna Perenna and Io are one and the same. There is also a strong similarity between Anna Perenna’s wanderings at sea and those of Aeneas, as noted by Littlewood (1980) 306. The similarities between Anna Perenna and Aeneas as founding figures will be discussed below.

²⁵ *Fasti* 3.619: *ne refer*.

²⁶ This can be partly attributed to Ovid’s disinclination to repeat material narrated by Vergil.

to save her. In fact, the details are so vague that one may ask whether Anna's transformation actually spares her from much violence. Granted, she is rescued from the attack arranged by Lavinia, but her rescue itself may open up the potential for other violent acts. In lines 3.645-8 above, she is "snatched away" (*rapuisse*) by the "desirous" (*cupidis*) waves of the river Numicius, and is changed into a *nympha Numici*. There may be more violence latent in this narrative than is apparent on the surface.

This description, including the simile to a frightened animal fleeing a predator, is evocative of the many rapes that gods in the *Fasti* commit against mortal women. Indeed, some scholars assume that Anna Perenna's apotheosis has a sexual element, to the effect that Anna Perenna's salvation from Lavinia's henchmen is dependent upon a marriage-type arrangement between her and the river god.²⁷ In this case, her apotheosis would be much more similar to the rape narratives examined in chapter three, the encounter between Rhea Silvia and Anio examined at the end of chapter two, and the rescue of Helle by Neptune footnoted above. No sexual contact between Anna Perenna and Numicius is specified here, and insofar as the sexual element is prominently foregrounded in the rape narratives examined in chapter three, I have categorized Anna Perenna's story outside of the rape stories. Even if a sexual element is being hinted at in Numicius' actions, I find it significant that Anna Perenna (like Helle) is being saved by Numicius from a separate, deadly threat: at the moment of her apotheosis, Anna Perenna's primary concern is escaping from her would-be assassins, and Numicius' (sexual?) attention is presented as an alternative to death. In contrast, in the rape stories the rape itself is the primary threat; the rape victims are not simultaneously menaced by mortal danger.

²⁷ E.g. Brugnoli (1991) 148.

Anna Perenna's apotheosis, whether or not it contains a sexual aspect, clearly serves as a salvation from mortal danger, and in this regard she is comparable to Ino and Julius Caesar in the *Fasti*. While the raped women in chapter three are ostensibly compensated for the violence perpetrated against them with apotheosis or other supernatural transformation, Anna Perenna is transformed and thereby saved before she suffers such violence. In this case the apotheosis is prompted not by completed violence, but by threatened violence so immediate that the threat has become sufficient surrogate for the violence itself; the implication being that the visceral experience of terror at impending death is the equivalent of dying. Anna is constantly subject to violence, including the extensive violence she suffers in her expulsion from Tyre and Carthage, the threatened violence evident in Lavinia's (unsuccessful) ambush, and the rape that she may suffer from Numicius. All in all, Anna Perenna's long history of suffering builds the theme inescapable in Ovid that apotheosis is not a pleasurable process, possibly not even a desirable process, and fraught with the potential for irreversible violence.

In fact, Anna's apotheosis makes a curious contrast with the transformations of other fleeing women in the *Metamorphoses*. There are a plethora of women who flee from attackers (libidinous or otherwise) in Ovid's poetry, but in the *Metamorphoses*, most commonly these stories are resolved in a way that deprives the woman of agency or protection: she is transformed into a plant, a spring, a stone. In the *Fasti*, a different pattern emerges, in which pursued women are usually promoted to divinity and thereby invested with power.²⁸ In particular, Anna recalls the story of Io from the *Metamorphoses*, who in bovine form prays for her own salvation from her long trials, and is finally granted promotion to divinity. Later on in the *Metamorphoses*, Io is able to

²⁸ See chapter three.

return as the goddess Isis and influence the narrative through her divine powers.²⁹ Anna Perenna similarly flees from her attackers and is saved by divine promotion. Although Anna's actions in this narrative--jumping out a window, running away, and hiding in the rushes--are directed toward escaping a threat, and she has no active participation in her transformation, the transformation to a nymph invests her with more power than she had as a mortal. Now she is not only safe from her attackers, but she assumes a position of power over mortals generally, and is able to exercise divine power as a goddess. The ability of the rape victims in chapter three to exercise their divine prerogatives is, in contrast, somewhat questionable.

Here I would call attention to Juturna, who appears in the story of Lara (Lara will be examined extensively in chapter three). Juturna has attracted the unwanted sexual attention of Jupiter, and Jupiter is determined coerce her into sex despite her persistent attempts to evade him. In the *Fasti*, Juturna is only mentioned in the context of the violence that others wish to perpetrate against her, even if (based on a reading the *Fasti* in conversation with the *Aeneid*), this violence is a necessary prerequisite of her apotheosis. It is interesting, nonetheless, that Juturna and Anna Perenna are two of the characters appearing in the *Fasti* whose background is most essentially dependent upon information found in the *Aeneid* (and not in other literature). In other words, Ovid is presumably counting on his readers to import the histories of Anna and Juturna from Vergil.³⁰ Juturna is a character fleshed out in the later books of the *Aeneid*, but not otherwise prominent in literature;³¹ Anna has a significant role in the fourth book of the *Aeneid*, but is otherwise

²⁹ See Beek (forthcoming).

³⁰ Barchiesi (1997) 21-2.

³¹ On Juturna, see Wiseman (2004) 158-63.

practically unknown in Latin literature.³² Ovid's Juturna and Anna seem uniquely appropriated from Vergil.

To this end, we should backtrack to Ovid's introductory description of how Anna is forced out of Troy, how she reconnects with Aeneas in Italy, and how these stories draw on Vergilian precedent.

*arserat Aeneae Dido miserabilis igne,
arserat exstructis in sua fata rogis,
compositusque cinis, tumulique in marmore carmen
hoc breve, quod moriens ipsa reliquit, erat:
PRAEBVIT AENEAS ET CAUSAM MORTIS ET ENSEM:
IPSA SVA DIDO CONCIDIT VSA MANV.
protinus invadunt Numidae sine vindice regnum,
et potitur capta Maurus Iarba domo,
seque memor spretum 'thalamis tamen' inquit 'Elissae
en ego, quem totiens reppulit illa, fruor.'
diffugiunt Tyrii quo quemque agit error...
ducitur ad Laurens ingenti flamine litus
puppis, et expositis omnibus hausta perit.
iam pius Aeneas regno nataque Latini
auctus erat, populos miscueratque duos.
litore dotali solo comitatus Achate
secretum nudo dum pede carpit iter,
aspicit errantem, nec credere sustinet Annam
esse: quid in Latios illa veniret agros?
dum secum Aeneas, 'Anna est!' exclamat Achates:
ad nomen voltus sustulit illa suos.
heu, quid agat? fugiat? quos terrae quaerat hiatus?
ante oculos miserae fata sororis erant.
sensit, et adloquitur trepidam Cythereius heros
(flet tamen admonitu motus, Elissa, tui):
'Anna, per hanc iuro, quam quondam audire solebas
tellurem fato prosperiore dari,
perque deos comites, hac nuper sede locatos,
saepe meas illos increpuisse moras.
nec timui de morte tamen: metus abfuit iste.
ei mihi, credibili fortior illa fuit.
ne refer: aspexi non illo corpore digna
vulnera Tartareas ausus adire domos.
at tu, seu ratio te nostris adpulit oris*

³² On Anna Perenna, see Wiseman (2004) 81-4.

*sive deus, regni commoda carpe mei.
multa tibi memores, nil non debemus Elissae:
nomine grata tuo, grata sororis eris.'*

Poor Dido had burned in the flame of Aeneas, she had burned also on the pyre built for her own death. The ash was gathered together, and this short verse, which she herself composed while dying, was written in the marble of her tomb: AENEAS PROVIDED BOTH THE SWORD AND THE MOTIVE FOR MY DEATH: BUT I, DIDO, DIED BY MY OWN HAND. Immediately the Numidians invaded the kingdom that lacked a defender, and the African Iarbas took possession of the captured home, and, remembering that he had been rejected, he said, "But look, now I inhabit Elissa's bedroom, even though she rejected me so many times." The Tyrians fled whichever way the road took them...[Anna's] ship is driven to the Laurentian shore by a huge blast of wind, and is destroyed, having been drained, with all its passengers washed out. At that time dutiful Aeneas had been elevated by the kingdom and daughter of Latinus, and had blended the two populations. Aeneas, accompanied only by Achates, was walking a secluded path barefoot on the shore that was his wedding present, and he saw Anna wandering, nor was he able to believe that she was Anna, for why should she come into the Latian fields? While Aeneas wondered to himself, Achates exclaimed "It's Anna!" and she lifted her face upon hearing her name. Alas, what should she do? Should she flee? What cleft of the earth would she seek out? The death of her wretched sister was before her eyes. The Cytherian hero [Aeneas] sensed this, and he addressed the fearful woman (although he was pained by the warning of your movements, Dido): "Anna, I swear to you by the land which you were formerly accustomed to hear would be given [to me] under better auspices, by the gods that are my companions, recently settled in this location: often those gods reproved my delays. I did not fear, however, that she would die: that fear was absent. Alas for me, she was braver than I believed. Do not tell the story [of her death]: I saw the wounds, not worthy of her body, when I dared to approach the house of Tartarus. But you, whether your conscious decision or a god drives you toward our shores, accept the conveniences of my kingdom. Many things I will recount to you, as we owe much to Dido; you will be welcome due to your identity, and that of your sister."³³

The conversation between the *Aeneid* and the *Fasti* is heavily stressed here. Ovid seems to pick up where Vergil left off in his history of Carthage and the relationship between Dido and Aeneas, and, within this relatively short excerpt, manages to efficiently hit the points of greatest drama and emotional force in the relationship between Aeneas and Dido: the fatally intense passion of the relationship, the interference of Rumor and Iarbas, Dido's acrimonious suicide, and Aeneas' address to Dido in the underworld.³⁴ Although Ovid exercises Anna's Vergilian backstory within the *Fasti*, he does not retell the

³³ *Fasti* 3.545-56, 599-624.

³⁴ Additionally, Ovid's Aeneas makes a few subtle but pointed references to his own perilous adventures, also well known from Vergil: he resettled his "companion gods" in Italy, and on the way "dared" to travel down to Tartarus.

Aeneid,³⁵ but rather builds up his own independent story, one not earlier attested in Latin literature.³⁶

Reinforcing Anna's history in the *Aeneid* is the fact that Anna's travels mirror the travels of Aeneas in many respects, as Porte describes: "Le lecteur des *Fastes* découvre qu'Ovide a composé une *Énéide* en miniature, dont Anna est, cette fois, l'héroïne!"³⁷ Porte identifies Anna in this transposed *Aeneid* as the avatar of Aeneas (she speaks of "une *assimilation* complète entre *Énée* et *Anna*,"³⁸), although McKeown in his similar comparison of the two narratives takes a broader view and casts Anna sometimes in the role of Aeneas, sometimes in that of Dido.³⁹ Most of all, there is a striking similarity between Anna's escape from Lavinia, and Aeneas' escape from Carthage. In Anna's highly compressed journey, her escape from Lavinia is described in relatively substantial detail, and the comparison to Aeneas' escape stands out because both escapes are precipitated in the same way: after going to sleep, they receive a supernatural warning of an impending attack.⁴⁰ After Lavinia conceives a burning hatred of Anna, Anna sees Dido's shade in a dream:

³⁵ As in the "little *Aeneid*" in the *Met.*, Ovid deliberately avoids retelling material from the *Aeneid*.

³⁶ The *Fasti* contains many stories that are not attested in earlier literature. Although this fact can be read in a variety of ways depending on the degree of inventiveness or (dis)honesty the reader wishes to attribute to Ovid, I find Mary Beard's (1987:6-7) reading of the origin of the Parilia useful in interpreting this tendency: "The wide variety of different explanations offered by our ancient sources is an indication of the strongly evocative power of the festival itself: it had no single meaning; it constantly generated new and changing stories and interpretations." The relevance of a festival, according to Beard, depended on its "capacity to be constantly reinterpreted and re-understood." Ovid freely engages in this process of reinterpreting aspects of religion in ways that are relevant to his own literary aims, and even if this makes his myths idiosyncratic and distances them from the traditional canon, this is no reason to condemn his stories of Anna Perenna as "inauthentic." Cf. Phillips (1992), who acknowledges Ovid's capacity to rework the calendar and suit it to his needs.

³⁷ Porte (1985) 144-50.

³⁸ Porte (1985) 145.

³⁹ McKeown (1984) 170-1.

⁴⁰ There is also a strong suggestion of Aeneas' flight from Troy, and Hector's succinct nocturnal warning (*Aen.* 2.268-97) (Littlewood (1980) 306 and 314 remarks on this connection briefly), but the mirroring of Aeneas' flight from Anna's home versus Anna's flight from Aeneas' home overwhelmingly stresses the parallelism between the two incidents.

*nox erat: ante torum visa est adstare sororis
squalenti Dido sanguinolenta coma
et 'fuge, ne dubita, maestum fuge,' dicere 'tectum';
sub verbum querulas impulit aura fores.*

It was night: Dido, blood-soaked and with filthy hair, seemed to stand before her sister's bed, saying: "Flee this grim house without hesitation," and following close upon the words, a wind rattled the doors with a groan.⁴¹

Aeneas likewise receives a nocturnal warning, given in somewhat more detail:

*Aeneas celsa in puppi iam certus eundi
carpebat somnos rebus iam rite paratis.
huic se forma dei uultu redeuntis eodem
obtulit in somnis rursusque ita uisa monere est,
omnia Mercurio similis, uocemque coloremque
et crinis flauos et membra decora iuuenta:
'nate dea, potes hoc sub casu ducere somnos,
nec quae te circum stent deinde pericula cernis,
demens, nec Zephyros audis spirare secundos?
illa dolos dirumque nefas in pectore uersat
certa mori, uariosque irarum concitat aestus.
non fugis hinc praeceps, dum praecipitare potestas?
iam mare turbari trabibus saeuasque uidebis
conlucere faces, iam feruere litora flammis,
si te his attigerit terris Aurora morantem.
heia age, rumpe moras. uarium et mutabile semper
femina.' sic fatus nocti se immiscuit atrae.*

Aeneas in his lofty ship, now certain of leaving, was taking sleep with everything ready and in order. But to him the shape of a god--in every respect similar to Mercury, with his voice and his color and his blonde hair and his limbs, shapely with youth--returning with the same face [i.e., from when Mercury appeared to Aeneas earlier] produced itself in a dream and appeared to warn him again: "Goddess-born, are you able to take sleep in the shadow of this disaster, or do you thoughtlessly not perceive the dangers that already are arrayed around you, nor hear the helpful breezes blowing? That woman [Dido] is plotting traps and horrible betrayal in her heart, set on death, and she stirs up unpredictable storms of rage. And you are not fleeing from here headlong, while you are still able? Soon you will see the sea stirred up with barks and the bright lightning bolts flashing, soon you will see the shore raging with flame, if Aurora should reach you still delaying in these lands. Go, stop delaying. A woman is always a fickle and changeable thing." Thus having spoken, he dissipated in the dark night.⁴²

The most important difference between these two episodes is that the danger to Anna is real: Lavinia, in her jealousy, has constructed a plot against her husband's guest, and thus

⁴¹ *Fasti* 3.639-42.

⁴² *Aen.* 4.554-570.

Dido's ghost appears to stave off a real threat to Anna's life. In Aeneas' case, either Mercury is misrepresenting the threat in an attempt to force Aeneas to leave promptly--Dido may be *certa mori*, but the death in question is unambiguously her own, and no one else's--or the threat has been insufficiently communicated outside of Mercury's speech. Despite her rancor for Aeneas, Dido never threatens harm to his person, and in fact retains enough affection for him to beg for a "little Aeneas."⁴³ After his departure she wishes harm on his descendants, but not on Aeneas, and while her *anger* is directed at him, her *violence* is directed at herself. And while there is a certain conceptual connection between the motivations for the attacks--both Lavinia and Dido (as Mercury represents her "plotting an attack") are attempting to prevent Aeneas from transferring his attention from a romantic claim to another priority--the substance behind Dido's attack, as evidenced in the narrative, does not measure up to the violence Lavinia turns on Anna.

The fact that both the attack on Anna and the attack on Aeneas are motivated by competition for not just a man's attention, but specifically *Aeneas'* attention is a substantial link between these two episodes. It is also noteworthy that when Aeneas escapes Dido's alleged plot, he is escaping Anna as well, with the result that Lavinia's attack on Anna may be construed as a sort of belated, misplaced revenge for being allied with Dido, who was the aggressor in the "attack" on Aeneas. Moreover, the supernatural aspect rises to prominence because Aeneas will be himself apotheosed, though this fact is only alluded to in the *Aeneid* and will not be directly narrated in the *Fasti* either. Still, Aeneas' apotheosis is described in detail in the *Metamorphoses*. We see Aeneas shed his humanity and ascend to Olympus quite clearly:

⁴³ *Aen.* 4.328-9.

*litus adit Laurens, ubi tectus harundine serpit
in freta flumineis uicina Numicus undis.
hunc iubet Aeneae quaecumque obnoxia morti
abluere et tacito deferre sub aequora cursu.
corniger exsequitur Veneris mandata suisque
quidquid in Aenea fuerat mortale repurgat
et respergit aquis; pars optima restitit illi.
lustratum genetrix diuino corpus odore
unxit et ambrosia cum dulci nectare mixta
contigit os fecitque deum, quem turba Quirini
nuncupat Indigetem temploque arisque recepit.*

[Venus] approached the Laurentian shore, where the Numicus flows, shaded with reeds, through its fluid waves into the nearby streams. She orders Numicus to remove whatever is subject to death and to wash it away in its placid stream to the sea. The horned god [Numicus] carries out the orders of Venus and cleans away whatever was mortal in Aeneas and sprinkles him with his waters; he retains his best part. His mother anoints his purified body with a divine fragrance and applies to his mouth ambrosia mixed with sweet nectar and makes him a god, whom the Romans call Indiges, and they receive him with a temple and altars.⁴⁴

Not only are both Anna and Aeneas transformed from their mortal state,⁴⁵ but both Anna and Aeneas are transformed by the same agent: the river Numicus/Numicius.⁴⁶ This unexpected association between Aeneas and Anna is surprising, not in the least because she is strongly allied with one of his antagonists, at least in origin. Anna is not only a representative of a state that is avowedly hostile to Rome, but moreover she would be justified in bearing a personal animosity toward the man who was responsible for her sister's death and upon whose descendants her sister swore vengeance.⁴⁷ It is beyond

⁴⁴ *Met.* 14.598-608.

⁴⁵ Interestingly, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 1.64.4-5) provides two alternative traditions of Aeneas' fate: either he fell in battle near Lavinium, or he drowned in the Numicius. Ovid presents only a single version. The mystic double tradition resembles the double tradition of Romulus' fate, well-known from Livy (1.16.3-5) although its double nature is denied by Ovid in the *Fasti* (see chapter two). Near the site of ancient Lavinium and the ancient course of the Numicius is a *heroon* dedicated to Aeneas, dated by Cornell (1995) to the seventh century (Cornell 68), adjacent to the archaic Altars of the Latin League. Alföldi (1965) 250-4 discusses this site's importance in the cult of Aeneas and Aeneas' unique nature among divinities.

⁴⁶ Despite the variant names, Numicus and Numicius are the same river, generally agreed to be the Rio Torto near Lavinium (modern Pratica di Mare), on which see Frazer (1929) s.v. 3.647.

⁴⁷ *Aen.* 4.607-29. It may be worth noting that, to follow the narrative of the *Fasti* to the letter, the Carthaginian state has effectively been destroyed and dismantled by Iarbas and his allies, in which case there is no state-level feud between Aeneas and Anna. This is a blatant discontinuity with history, in which the Carthaginian state traced its foundations back to Dido, uninterrupted until the city was toppled by

question that Anna is being endowed with privilege and relieved of stigma, beyond what she was in the *Aeneid*, beyond what she was in any tradition--the question is *why* Ovid is taking the trouble to reintegrate an ostensibly antagonistic character into a cooperative relationship with Aeneas.

To address this issue, I would delve further into Anna's political role. Anna in the *Fasti* is presented from her first appearance as a person connected to, but independent of, the founding fathers of Rome. As the sister of Dido, she is heiress to the legacy of the Tyrian/Punic kingdom, a political entity which, as was well known from the *Aeneid*, had an uncomfortable relationship with Aeneas and the proto-Romans: when Aeneas first appeared in Dido's kingdom, he invoked and took advantage of a hospitality relationship, which quickly deteriorated after the falling-out between Aeneas and Dido, providing precedent for the following centuries of conflict between the two states. Nevertheless, when (as described in the *Fasti*) Anna arrives in Latium as a refugee from an African invasion, she is received hospitably by Aeneas--so hospitably, in fact, that Lavinia suspects Anna as a rival for her husband's affections, and plots violence against her.⁴⁸ Anna is saved from this attack by transformation into a goddess. With her background and ties to Tyre and Carthage, it seems that Anna could have been presented as a political figure, a representative of either the exiled Tyrian house or the longstanding Roman enemies, the Carthaginians. Ovid, however, has chosen to present Anna as independent of either of those states, with her Punic kingdom destroyed and her Tyrian origins barely

Scipio Aemilianus in 146. Perhaps this narrative of Anna is a fantasy, and the three conflicting narratives of Anna are not intended to be taken as fact either in harmony or isolation, but are merely presented by Ovid as imaginative fantasies built out of familiar literary characters.

⁴⁸ There is a variant legend, reported by Varro and preserved in Servius Danielus (*ad Aen.* 5.4), in which Aeneas became romantically entangled not with Dido, but rather with Anna. If that tradition is being alluded to by Ovid, he is doing so very obliquely.

mentioned.⁴⁹ Insofar as she does not represent a hostile state, her story is portrayed as a tragic narrative independent of contemporary politics. Having shed her Carthaginian background, Anna is more sympathetic to a Roman audience.

Despite the substantial allusions to Vergilian events, Anna Perenna's background is to a large extent left vague. Not only is Anna presented as politically independent when she encounters Aeneas, but Ovid even suggests that this character may not be Dido's sister at all, but may be someone entirely different. Ovid follows Anna's apotheosis with several different explanations, presented in minimal detail, of who Anna Perenna was before she was apotheosed:

*sunt quibus haec Luna est, quia mensibus impleat annum;
pars Themis, Inachiam pars putat esse bovem.⁵⁰
invenies, qui te nymphen Azanida dicant
teque Jovi primos, Anna, dedisse cibos.*

There are those according to whom she is the Moon, because she fills the year out with months; some think that she is Themis, or the Inachian cow. You will even find, Anna, those who would say you are the nymph, the daughter of Azan, who gave Jupiter his first nourishment.⁵¹

After these brief speculative asides, Ovid moves into another story of an Anna who seems to have little to do with Dido's sister. Anna of Bovillae was an elderly woman who fed the plebs during their secession to the Mons Sacer. Obviously, her placement within comparatively recent historical time prevents this Anna from sharing an identity with Dido's sister of ancient legend. Moreover, the reverence for this Anna is never taken to the level of deification: although she may have provided food for the plebs, and he claims that they set up a statue (*signum*) in her honor, her honors remain firmly within the mortal realm. Finally, Ovid returns to the elderly goddess Anna Perenna and shows her playing a

⁴⁹ She is called *Sidonis* at 3.649.

⁵⁰ See the footnote above for the connection between Anna Perenna and Io.

⁵¹ *Fasti* 3.657-60.

practical joke on Mars. This third and last extended narrative about Anna Perenna is a bawdy story in which Mars has fallen in love with Minerva and wishes to formally marry her. He approaches the elderly goddess Anna Perenna to act as the go-between; she agrees to do so, but elects to ignore Minerva and herself take the position of the bride; Mars is duly surprised when he unveils her.

*nuper erat dea facta: venit Gradivus ad Annam,
et cum seducta talia verba facit:
'mense meo coleris, iunxi mea tempora tecum;
pendet ab officio spes mihi magna tuo.
armifer armiferae correptus amore Minervae
uror, et hoc longo tempore volnus alo.
effice, di studio similes coeamus in unum:
conveniunt partes hae tibi, comis anus.'*
*dixerat; illa deum promisso ludit inani,
et stultam dubia spem trahit usque mora.
saepius instanti 'mandata peregrinus' inquit;
'evicta est: precibus vix dedit illa manus.'*
*credit amans thalamosque parat. deducitur illuc
Anna tegens voltus, ut nova nupta, suos.
oscula sumpturus subito Mars aspicit Annam:
nunc pudor elusum, nunc subit ira, deum.
ridet amatorem carae nova diva Minervae,
nec res hac Veneri gratior ulla fuit.*

[Anna] had recently been apotheosed, when Mars came to Anna and spoke these words to her after he drew her aside: "You are worshipped in my month; I united my territory with yours; a great wish of mine depends upon your help. Being the armed god, I have been seized by a desire for the armed goddess Minerva; I am on fire, and I have nurtured this passion for a long time. Arrange it that with your help we similar gods might come together as one: this role suits you, friendly grandmother." He said this, but she deceived the god with empty promises, and she dragged out his foolish hope with misleading delays. Often she said when he stood before her: "I have accomplished your orders. She has capitulated, and she just now ceded her hand to your prayers." The lover prepared his wedding chamber. She was led there--Anna, that is, covering her face, in the custom of a bride. When he was about to take a kiss, Mars suddenly caught sight of Anna, and at one moment shame comes upon him, but at another, anger. The recently-created goddess laughed at the lover of beloved Minerva, and nothing was more amusing to Venus than this.⁵²

As in the case of Io in the *Metamorphoses*, Anna Perenna does not immediately fade out of the narrative after her apotheosis, but she returns to exercise her new divine power in a

⁵² *Fasti* 3.677-94.

way that is visible to the audience. Moreover, she exercises her divine power to perform the substantial feat of besting an Olympian god. Here Anna Perenna is shown to quickly take stock of Mars' infatuation, and uses that assessment to her own ends: she takes advantage of his infatuation and uses deception to bring a well-built and sexually aroused man into her bed, an event that she obviously relishes.⁵³ In this successful deception, the audience witnesses Anna Perenna bearing a certain degree of power in taking sexual advantage of a god, apparently to his chagrin, a feat that is unparalleled in the rest of the Ovidian corpus. In most episodes of sexual assertion, the act is accomplished by force by a more powerful character over a less powerful character: a god rapes a mortal, a god rapes a nymph, a man rapes a girl. In a few cases, such as Rhea Silvia's rape by Mars in the *Fasti* (see chapter two), the rape is accomplished not by force but because the victim is incapacitated by sleep. The fact that Anna Perenna, a nymph subordinated to a minor river god, formerly a mortal, and represented as an elderly woman to boot, takes advantage of the war god himself is certainly a feat for the ages, and one that can only be accomplished by trickery, not by force.

Amusing though the different stories of Anna Perenna may be, they are difficult to reconcile with one another, and further discussion is required of the multiple aetiologies that Ovid presents for certain phenomena. Frequently in the *Fasti* Ovid, when explaining a particular phenomenon, will provide several possible mutually exclusive aetiologies, often without a clear indication of which one is correct.⁵⁴ Usually this is attributed to a "Callimachean" impulse to thoroughly report all known answers to a

⁵³ The text allows for a certain degree of flexibility in interpretation of whether Mars actually has sex with Anna Perenna before he unveils her.

⁵⁴ In this practice Ovid apes the hymnic convention of naming a deity by as many titles as possible and deferring to the deity to choose which title is most appropriate; see Miller (1992) 27.

question as a signal that he has thoroughly researched the possibilities.⁵⁵ Fantham asserts that “It is characteristic of Roman poetry to exploit all possible accounts rather than suppress any by favoring one particular explanation.”⁵⁶ Harries also refers to “the familiar didactic device of presenting multiple instances of causation in a succession of alternative clauses. It is well known that this device does not reflect a genuine scholarly predicament but is a traditional mark of the didactic poet’s pose as a seemingly open-minded and judicious investigator.”⁵⁷ Anna Perenna’s origin seems to be a question that Ovid is unwilling to answer definitively, although he devotes more lines of poetry to the adventures of Dido’s sister than he does to any other possibility. The narrative of Dido’s sister’s apotheosis easily eclipses the alternatives, with secondary attention allotted to Anna of Bovillae and Anna Perenna’s practical joke.

Ovid’s extended and self-contradictory exposition of Anna Perenna is problematic because Ovid is providing multiple aetiologies not for an abstruse tradition or a cult title of a deity, but the deity’s very identity. The description of Anna Perenna and her history is particularly difficult to accept due to the inclusion of a historical anecdote in the middle of several mythic stories; it is hard to make Anna of Bovillae, tied as she is to historical events that were well within the bounds of recorded history, compatible with the mythic milieu of the surrounding stories, especially when all of these stories in theory

⁵⁵ Miller (1983), in studying the Callimachean background to the *Fasti*, notes Ovid’s lack of serious interest in finding the true aetiologies, and notes that Ovid takes a playful approach to his investigative endeavor. In particular he points to the debate between the Muses on the origin of the name of May (*Fasti* 5.1-110) and points out that Ovid specifically declines to choose between the variant aetiologies they present because “he rather hopes to secure an equal blessing from all of the Muses by not praising one more than another” (Miller 188). Miller also calls attention to the debate over the origins of the name of June (6.97-100) as a point when Ovid specifically directs the reader to believe the aetiology of his or her own choice, “an address which signals the fundamental levity in Ovid’s concern for aetiology” (Miller 189). Miller also notes that “As far as we know Callimachus did not ever present variant explanations without also deciding among them” (Miller 188), marking these particular debates as specifically non-Callimachean and originally Ovidian. Cf. Wilkinson (1955) 265.

⁵⁶ Fantham (1998) 289, on the origin of the Parilia.

⁵⁷ Harries (1989) 184.

refer to the same character. Within the *Fasti* there is no apotheosis described for Anna of Bovillae; if she is the same nymph who deceived Mars, her apotheosis must be assumed. Among the alternative identities from Greek mythology and Roman legend--Dido's sister, Io, Themis, Amalthea, and Luna--all of them clearly were apotheosed or established as divine in other sources. This historical plebeian stands out as the most incompatible. Miller speaks of the practice of presenting multiple aetiologies as a hymnic practice, intended to flatter and propitiate a god who is frequently so immediate to the text that he or she is directly addressed by Ovid, and responds to him in the first person. But Anna Perenna is not an addressee of the narrator of the *Fasti*, and if she is merely a historical plebeian who was commemorated with a statue and remembered in a holiday but otherwise long dead and confined to the underworld, Ovid clearly has no need to flatter or propitiate her. The inability to plausibly connect Anna of Bovillae to the other accounts encourages the reader to disregard the Bovillae account as irrelevant, implausible, impossible.

On the other hand, we may read Ovid as merely describing the origins of an annual festival rather than those of a goddess. If the aetiology is presented for the event rather than the goddess, that puts a different spin on the matter: even though the first and longest episode narrated on the Ides of March is the narrative of Dido's sister's apotheosis, Anna Perenna's divinity per se is neither the matter to be explained nor in any way essential to the real matter of discussion, namely an answer to the question of why people hold picnics on the Ides of March. The woman commemorated by such an event

does not need to be divine,⁵⁸ and Anna Perenna's apotheosis is merely incidental to the narrative of her journey to Italy and establishment as an Italian character.

Here it is useful to examine the origin of Anna Perenna in Italian myth and folklore.

Anna Perenna was originally a goddess of the turning of the year, represented as an elderly woman; both her names seem to be derived from the Latin word *annus*.⁵⁹ Like most rustic Italian agricultural deities, her sphere is small, restrictive, and overlapping with the functions of other similar deities (such as Janus, Vertumnus, and other seasonal gods who preside over the calendar).⁶⁰ Within the *Fasti* Anna Perenna is first mentioned at 3.146, outside of the three narratives dedicated to her, when Ovid is explaining the various reasons why the calendar used to begin in March, but was later changed to include January and February. Anna is not described in detail here, but the reference to her clearly alludes to her Italic role as goddess of the change from one year to another: as a proof that the year once began in March, Ovid points out that *Anna quod hoc coepta est mense Perenna coli*: Anna Perenna begins to be worshipped in this month.

The effect, however, of juxtaposing mutually incompatible stories goes beyond Ovid's construction of his own authority if the reader attempts to reconcile them unsuccessfully, and is forced to resolve issues that are incompatible not only in fact, but also in tone. In this particular section of the *Fasti*, Barchiesi remarks that "the strident incompatibility between these mutually irrelevant commemorations undermines the

⁵⁸ This large community picnic recalls Roman practices to commemorate dead family members. In such practices, the honorands are not divine in the same sense that Anna Perenna (the *nympha Numici*) is divine, so the humble Anna of Bovillae could be suitably honored with the same practices as the family dead.

⁵⁹ Frazer (1929) endorses this derivation, and rejects the derivation from *amne perenne* as "childish" (s.v. 3.114).

⁶⁰ The profusion of Roman gods with exceptionally granular spheres of influence was famously mocked by Augustine, *CD* 4.8.

efficacy of the propaganda of Caesar's avenger,"⁶¹ which is to say, the three Anna Perenna stories detract not only from each other, but from the (presumably) more serious issue of Caesar's apotheosis, narrated as a brief coda to the same day. Nevertheless, Barchiesi claims that this Callimachean presentation of alternatives in fact worked to Ovid's disadvantage politically, to wit: in earlier times, the calendar was controlled by no central authority, and different calendars and municipalities could observe different occasions for their own reasons. Augustus stifled this flexibility by making himself the defining authority for calendars, and as such he did not approve of Ovid's egalitarian calendrical format.⁶²

It may seem counterintuitive to find in the *Fasti* so many commemorative events for which the author does not provide an authoritative decision on what is being commemorated, and the effect of conflicting aetiologies within the *Fasti* has been considered in detail by various scholars.⁶³ Although conflicting *aetia* set in close proximity can suggest a number of weaknesses in the chronicler's authority (indecision, uncertainty, sloppy editing, incomplete research, and so on), discrepancies in the details of a narrative need not be read as a weakness from a literary standpoint, as is eloquently argued by Ralph Hexter in his article "What was the Trojan Horse Made of?" Littlewood claims that Ovid skillfully blends these conflicting aetiologies into a "studied *assymetria*...governed by a simple rhetorical *dispositio*," with the result that even the narration of Julius Caesar's death builds to an "effective conclusion" to the description of the Ides of March,⁶⁴ although generally the conflicting explanations are read as less

⁶¹ Barchiesi (1997) 129.

⁶² Barchiesi (1997) 71.

⁶³ Barchiesi (1991), Miller (1992).

⁶⁴ Littlewood (1980) 320-1.

designed than Littlewood makes them. Though Ovid's many aetiologies over the course of the *Fasti* may be speculative, or even demonstrably false (notably in the case of many etymologies⁶⁵), here he presents an open-ended choice between mutually-exclusive alternatives, that is, a case in which at least one of his explanations must be false. Even if this practice is intended to show evidence of his copious research, it has the unfortunate effect of undermining his credibility.⁶⁶ Ovid in this case seems to be trying to account for the obscure origins of an obscure goddess. Perhaps this conflict is more satisfactorily elucidated by Barchiesi's comment in "Discordant Muses" that "In Ovid, order does not seem to occur without repression."⁶⁷ When Ovid presents several parallel aetiologies and declines to make a judgment between them, the audience witnesses not only a lack of authority, but also a lack of repression. When no accounts are repressed, the reader is left with the impression that a profusion of knowledge is available, that he or she is being provided with unfiltered (but conveniently accumulated) source material and is at liberty to exercise his or her own judgment without interference from external authorities. Ovid is making a concerted effort to provide contradictory explanations and invite doubt from his readers; he presents himself as a compiler of stories rather than a font of absolute truth.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ Boyle (2000) speaks of Ovid's "bludgeoning etymology," in the context of deriving Janus from *hio*, but the idea is easily extended into Ovid's many other etymologies.

⁶⁶ Parker (1997) 10 argues that the multiple aetiologies, and particularly, Ovid's apparent inability to choose between them, undermine the persona's authority to educate the reader on any subject.

⁶⁷ Barchiesi (1991) 10.

⁶⁸ This practice, nevertheless, is not consistently followed; as is shown in the story of Lara (*Fasti* 2.582-4), in which Ovid gives two conflicting accounts of Tacita and disparages the one attributed to the *ebria anus* in preference to the one attributed to the *antiquos senes*.

Julius Caesar

Following very closely upon the stories of Anna Perenna's apotheosis and other adventures is, in honor of the Ides of March, a very brief nod to the assassination and deification of Julius Caesar. Aside from the coincidence of dates (Anna Perenna's festival falling on the same day as Caesar's assassination and apotheosis) there is a conceptual connection between the salutary apotheosis of Anna Perenna and Vesta's salvation of Caesar. Vesta gives a cursory description of the assassination of Caesar, but she is insistent that she removed Caesar from the scene *before* the murder, and only an *umbra* suffered the violence.⁶⁹

*ipsa virum rapui simulacraque nuda reliqui:
quae cecidit ferro, Caesaris umbra fuit.*

I myself snatched the man away and left behind a mere ghost: what fell by the sword was only Caesar's shade.⁷⁰

Anna's near escape from death by means of transformation is an introductory way of discussing Caesar's salvation by Vesta, a salvation that is not otherwise preserved in extant Latin. Barchiesi remarks that Vesta's involvement in Caesar's apotheosis is "a complete novelty,"⁷¹ and emphasizes the dissonance between the *Fasti*'s description of this transformation and the descriptions of the same mystical transformation in other works, most notably Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.⁷²

⁶⁹ One may also make a connection to the story of Callisto, insofar as Callisto is apotheosed in order to prevent her son from killing her, but only after she has already suffered rape, ostracism, and punitive transformation.

⁷⁰ *Fasti* 3.701-2.

⁷¹ Barchiesi (1997) 125.

⁷² Littlewood (1980), on the other hand, notes that Caesar's salvation at the hands of Vesta "is closely parallel to the epic version" in the *Met.* (Littlewood 320) in which Venus snatches Caesar away from harm moments before he is murdered. McGowan's (2009) chapter 3 ("God and Man: Caesar Augustus in Ovid's

*Ne foret hic igitur mortali semine cretus,
 ille deus faciendus erat; quod ut aurea uidit
 Aeneae genetrix, uidit quoque triste parari
 pontifici letum et coniurata arma moueri,
 palluit ut cunctis, ut cuique erat obuia, diuis
 'aspice' dicebat 'quanta mihi mole parentur
 insidiae quantaque caput cum fraude petatur,
 quod de Dardanio solum mihi restat Iulo...
 ...en acui sceleratos cernitis enses!
 quos prohibete, precor, facinusque repellite, neue
 caede sacerdotis flammis extinguite Vestae.'
 Talia nequiquam toto Venus anxia caelo
 uerba iacit superosque mouet; qui rumpere quamquam
 ferrea non possunt ueterum decreta sororum,
 signa tamen luctus dant haud incerta futuri.*

So that this man should not spring from mortal origins, that one must be made into a god; as soon as the golden mother of Aeneas realized this, she also saw that grim death was being plotted for the pontifex and that conspiring weapons were being organized, and as she blanched before all the gods, conspicuously in view of each one, she said: "Consider how much effort is being put into this ambush and how deceitfully his head, the only thing remaining from Dardanian Iulus, is sought...look, you see those swords, criminal in their sharpness! Deny them, I beg you, and prevent this disaster, and do not put out the flame of the priest of Vesta with this slaughter." Terrified Venus was flinging such words out in vain throughout the heavens, and was finding pity from the gods, but they were not able to circumvent the iron decrees of the ancient sisters, although they display signs of mourning, knowing the future for certain.⁷³

In this version, Venus rather than Vesta is the most active party. The narrator specifies that none of the gods can avert Caesar's fate, and they can only show their regret in the wake of his painful tragedy. Venus' canvassing of Olympus in an effort to raise support to save Caesar is a reflection of the political world within the divine. Caesar himself is presented as a symbol of unwarranted political violence vindicated by divine justice. It is curious that the event has been so substantially reframed when it reappears in the *Fasti*. The sponsoring goddess has been changed from Caesar's ancestress Venus to the goddess affiliated with his profession as pontifex maximus, Vesta. The energetic and melodramatic canvassing for divine permission to save Caesar is reduced to the

Exilic Mythology") is an excellent discussion of how the divinization of the Caesars is handled in Ovid's poetry, although he focuses on the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*.

⁷³ *Met.* 15.760-7, 776-82.

minimum, and the salvation *before* the attack is put in the most explicit terms possible. This again suggests that there is something disreputable about suffering violence, and Ovid in his “impeccable patriotism”⁷⁴ will not allow Caesar’s reputation to be tarnished. Given that Caesar’s fate has been deliberately reframed in the *Fasti* to contrast with Ovid’s interpretation from the *Metamorphoses*, the reader can see a very clear connection drawn between Anna Perenna and Caesar, two divine figures, discussed on the same day, whose violent deaths were averted by their transcendence to a fate beyond death.

The line *ne foret hic igitur mortali semine cretus* is somewhat confusing. The cause and effect idea here implied is that Augustus’ divinity was contingent upon him being the son of a god--which may be reasonable enough, considering that Octavian himself built his career upon being a *divi filius*. What is strange is the implication that Caesar had to be divine for the purpose of Augustus’ future benefit. More than the other apotheoses of the *Fasti*, Julius Caesar’s apotheosis spotlights the question of what causes a mortal to be apotheosed: is it divine lineage, great accomplishments, favor of the gods, or some other force?⁷⁵ Although others have paid attention to the euhemerist or non-euhemerist aspects of Ovid, Pandey’s article on the use of the *sidus Iulium* by Augustus--and particularly by others--presses this question in earnest, concluding that Julius Caesar’s deification was not, as is frequently stated, effected by Augustus. On the contrary, Julius’ Caesar’s deification was an outgrowth of his own achievements in life, rather than an initiative of the young Octavian; the idea that Octavian deified Caesar to

⁷⁴ Littlewood (1980) 321. For a more nuanced discussion of Ovid’s political motives in the *Fasti*, see chapter two.

⁷⁵ The process by which the Caesars were apotheosed, as described in Ovid’s poetry, and the celestial motivations behind the process, may be completely separate from the process as it played out in reality; McGowan (2009) 25-6 addresses the disjunction between physical reality and poetic reality, and how poetry may be a tool for creating gods.

advance his own political career is a retrojection of the influence Augustus wielded in his mature career upon his early and uncertain political life. In that case, if Ovid claims that Caesar was deified for the sake of Augustus' success, he is either propagating a misconception endemic to Augustus' later reign, cynically suggesting that Augustus had to manipulate the public to effect Caesar's (ostensibly undeserved) deification,⁷⁶ or else deliberately imputing supernatural motivation behind Caesar's deification (that is, *the gods decided* to apotheose Caesar so that Augustus would not be born from mortal origin). One may compare this line to the syncretism of Augustus and Romulus, in which Augustus is trumpeted as a magnificent ruler: on the surface, whenever Augustus is mentioned in the *Fasti*, Ovid unreservedly praises him, even in comparison to his exalted father. Ovid goes so far as to perform this sleight-of-hand by claiming that Augustus outstripped his father by deifying him, despite the political weakness of Octavian at the time of Caesar's death. Ovid praises Augustus effusively and illustrates his superiority to his forerunners by means of this neat play on ideas, based on a misconception apparently popular enough that his audience would not object to it.

When Caesar's apotheosis actually arrives in the *Metamorphoses*, it is conspicuously a catasterism, as opposed to an anthropomorphic apotheosis: Caesar's comet not only confirms his apotheosis, but it is in fact the deified Caesar.

*'hanc animam interea caeso de corpore raptam
fac iubar, ut semper Capitolia nostra forumque
Diuus ab excelsa prospectet Iulius aede.'
Vix ea fatus erat, media cum sede senatus
constitit alma Venus nulli cernenda suique
Caesaris eripuit membris nec in aera solui
passa recentem animam caelestibus intulit astris.
dumque tulit, lumen capere atque ignescere sensit*

⁷⁶ Pandey (2013) 437-8.

*emisitque sinu; luna volat altius illa
flammiferumque trahens spatioso limite crinem
stella micat natique uidens bene facta fatetur
esse suis maiora et uinci gaudet ab illo.*

“In the meantime, make a beam of light out of [Caesar’s] soul after you have snatched it from his murdered body, so that Divus Iulius will always look out from his lofty temple on the Capitoline and the Forum.” As soon as [Jupiter] said this, motherly Venus took up a place in the middle of the Senate’s meeting place, although she was visible to no one. She rescued Caesar’s newly-released soul from his body, and she did not allow it to dissolve into the air, but rather brought it to the heavenly stars. While she carried it, she noticed that it was beginning to spark and give off light, and she released her hold on it. It flew higher than the moon, and shone as a star, tracing a fiery trail in its extensive wake. And [Divus Iulius], seeing the accomplishments of his son, admits that his son’s deeds were greater than his own, and rejoices to be surpassed by him.⁷⁷

When this same transformation is undergone in the *Fasti*, the astral aspect is downplayed.

Although Vesta specifies that *ille quidem caelo positus Iovis atria vidit*,⁷⁸ “Caesar, having been situated in the sky, truly saw the halls of Jupiter,” he is not described as a star per se, and the reference to the *atria Iovis* is more suggestive of the Olympian home of the gods than the seclusion of catasterism.⁷⁹ The specific differences between anthropomorphic apotheosis and catasterism will be discussed in detail in chapter four, but for now it is enough to say that, in Ovidian works, these are different types of transformations with different privileges and statuses, and it is significant that Ovid portrays Caesar as undergoing a catasterism in the *Metamorphoses* only to shift to an (apparently) anthropomorphic apotheosis in the *Fasti*. Since catasterized gods are segregated from the living world in a sort of divine death, whereas anthropomorphic gods are able to inhabit and influence the world of gods and mortals, the effect of the change is to make *divus Iulius* more powerful and a continuing influence on Ovid’s world.

⁷⁷ *Met.* 15.840-51.

⁷⁸ *Fasti* 3.703.

⁷⁹ Domenicucci (1991) makes much of the astral character of Caesar’s apotheosis in the *Met.*, particularly regarding how its astral aspect is mirrored in the apotheoses of Romulus and Hersilie in the same work. The overall effect, according to Domenicucci, of laying stress on an astral apotheosis is to tie Caesar’s deification to the historical precedent of Romulus and Hersilie. Domenicucci 225 also calls attention to the difference between a mortal being taken to heaven body and soul, as opposed to a person’s soul being rescued from his or her body.

It is fruitful to ask, after all this discussion, why Julius Caesar is apotheosed. Ovid is generally taciturn when it comes to explaining why any particular character achieves apotheosis. In contrast to Cicero's Scipio's well reasoned explanation in *De Re Publica* that those who have done great service to the state graduate to a higher form of existence once their life on earth is complete, or the general current of Stoic thought (according to Pandey, common in Rome⁸⁰) that a better afterlife awaited the just and righteous, Ovid for all his apotheoses seldom provides a reason why these new gods are apotheosed, whether stated by a character or clearly implied by the narrative. As discussed above, in both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, characters who are apotheosed may occasionally be labeled as worthy of apotheosis by the gods who transform them, but even in those cases the gods seldom elaborate the reasons why the character deserves divinity. More often than not, the rationale for apotheosis seems quite arbitrary.

Nevertheless, for Julius Caesar Ovid provides a number of reasons why he was apotheosed, though they do not necessarily mesh well. Let us begin by noting that whenever his apotheosis is mentioned, there is a divine instigator behind it. The short passage at the end of the Ides of March episode in the *Fasti* shows Vesta describing how she chose to save Julius Caesar from murder by apotheosing him, though she does not name a reason why she apotheosed him. In the *Metamorphoses*, on the contrary, Venus is the one behind the apotheosis, and (alongside a lengthy list of Caesar's accomplishments) we have been given a reason why the gods chose to promote him to divinity: *Ne foret hic igitur mortali semine cretus, ille deus faciendus erat*. In this case we see Venus and other Olympians elevating Caesar on behalf of Augustus; the motive originates on Olympus, although one may say it resides on earth. Even so, both of these rationales are in a sense

⁸⁰ Pandey (2013) 417n34, 422n47.

contradicted by Ovid's remark at the end of the syncrisis that *caelestem fecit te [Romulum] pater, ille [Augustus] patrem*. In this bit of sophistry, Ovid states that it was neither Venus nor Vesta behind Caesar's apotheosis; the divine motive, if present, was paralleled, or even superseded, by the motive force of Augustus. After all, Ovid's point in the syncrisis is that Augustus is in all ways superior to his predecessor Romulus; as the crowning touch, he asserts that while Romulus was deified by his father, Augustus deified his own father, implying that the gods were uninvolved with Augustus' process of deifying Caesar. If they had been the primary agents behind the apotheosis, the event could hardly be cited as evidence of Augustus' superiority to Romulus. It is curious, and noteworthy, that this description of Caesar's deification is one of the few in the *Fasti* that is performed by mortals on earth--or at least, by a god who had not yet apotheosed.⁸¹

Given this background, we can gain a much better understanding of what context Ovid has laid when he names Augustus as the prime mover behind Julius Caesar's deification. One may postulate that Gradel's scheme of relative versus absolute divinity is at play here: in the immortal world, Julius Caesar is elevated to Olympus by Vesta or possibly Venus; meanwhile on earth, independently, mortals are also granting him divine honors. To take a more synthetic view of the matter, Augustus' action in deifying Caesar may only be a response to, or a reflection of, the divine decision to deify Caesar. But it is problematic for Ovid to claim, unmodified, that Augustus made his father a god, with the implication that he did so without support from Olympus. Not yet being a god himself, in doing so Augustus is disturbing the Hercules model. Caesar's deification is apparently not sanctioned by the major gods on Olympus, but rather only presumptuously asserted

⁸¹ Compare the deifications of Lucretia and Livia, which are initiated by the actions of mortals, as discussed in the appendix of this work.

by a mortal on earth, a system used only in the *Fasti* for the figures of Lucretia (whose divinity is asserted by Brutus) and Livia (who is referred to as divine by the narrator despite the fact that she was not deified until long after Ovid's death). Vesta's intervention confers absolute divinity on Caesar, and initiates his apotheosis, while his deification as recognized by the Roman state is initiated by Augustus.

If one steps away from the syncrisis, Julius Caesar's apotheosis in the *Fasti* fits the Hercules model rather well. He is put in danger of his life by a plotted assassination, he is rescued at the last moment by Vesta, and he is transported to Olympus to enjoy immortality. Although Julius Caesar seldom appears in the *Fasti* and for that reason does not have an extensive history attributed to him, his brief apotheosis narrative recalls that of Romulus in the *Metamorphoses*, another hero of the Roman state. Indeed, between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* Romulus and Julius Caesar seem to trade roles to a certain extent; in the *Metamorphoses* Romulus only appears in a very short passage narrating his apotheosis and is otherwise omitted from the narrative, but in the *Fasti* his exploits are covered extensively in a wealth of episodes. Julius Caesar, on the other hand, in the *Metamorphoses* is discussed extensively as the gods enumerate his accomplishments, whereas in the *Fasti* his appearances are restricted to the short summary of his apotheosis by Vesta. Given that Ovid has established that he has a large body of material to narrate for both men, the restricted attention to Romulus in the *Metamorphoses* and Caesar in the *Fasti* suggests that Ovid is afraid of saying the wrong thing politically, although his concerns are fixed on a different character in each of these works. Overall, his treatment of Caesar in the *Fasti* gives the impression of being carefully calculated and deliberately inoffensive, with no risks taken even to have the gods shower Caesar in praise.

Ino and Melicertes⁸²

The model of apotheosis given for Anna Perenna and Julius Caesar--that is, apotheosis as a means to avert violence--is also invoked in the transformation of Ino into Leucothea and Melicertes into Palaemon. This mother/son pair of a goddess and god have much in common with Anna Perenna insofar as the characters play off an influential literary tradition⁸³ and use intense personal and family tragedy as a background for the apotheosis narrative.⁸⁴ There is no denying the fact that Ino (one of the daughters of Cadmus and sisters of Semele) is a notorious character in mythology, and many of the reasons why are illustrated in Ovid's poetry.⁸⁵ Her family, and her city, have a long history of intramural violence and murder, going back to the fratricide of the *Spartoi*. She is frequently used as the metonym for the evil stepmother, since she not only plotted to have her stepchildren Phrixus and Helle murdered, she engineered a famine to do so, persuading her husband that the famine she caused could only be ended by sacrificing his

⁸² Ino/Leucothea/Leucothoe/Mater Matuta and Melicertes/Palaemon/Portunus suffer from a surfeit of naming conventions within the *Fasti*. For the sake of consistency, I will be referring to them as Ino and Melicertes, except where the alternative names are essential to my argument. Additionally, although Melicertes is apotheosed alongside his mother, he does not take an active role in the narrative, so my focus will rest on Ino. Farnell (1921) 39-42 notes that, in Greek cult, Melicertes was never a separate individual but was always worshipped as the son of Ino.

⁸³ For Anna Perenna, the primary literary influence is the *Aeneid*; for Ino and Melicertes, Euripides' *Bacchae* and other Theban tragedies, as well as Ovid's earlier treatment of the Theban myths in *Met.* book 3 passim and 4.416-603. Note as well the fact that Anna Perenna's part in the *Aeneid* is influenced by tragedy, cf. Panoussi (2009) among others.

⁸⁴ Another prominent connection between Anna and Ino is that both are descendants of Phoenician royalty, since Anna in the *Aeneid* is a daughter of the Phoenician king Belus, and Ino is a descendant of Cadmus, himself the son of the Phoenician king Agenor. This connection is downplayed in the *Fasti* since Ovid never alludes to the Phoenician origins of Ino, although he does describe Anna as *Sidonis* (3.649). Nevertheless, *Europa*, the famous sister of Cadmus, is likewise referred to as *Sidonis* at 5.610 and 5.617, and Ino is called *Cadmeis* at 6.553.

⁸⁵ Ino's depiction in myth is, of course, distinct from her depiction as a recipient of cult. For the Greek hero cult devoted to Ino, see Farnell (1921) 35-47, Palmer (1969).

children. The children were only saved by the divine intervention of a golden ram.⁸⁶ Later on, when Bacchus arrived in Thebes, Ino was one of the maenads who dismembered her nephew Pentheus.⁸⁷ Under a similarly divinely inspired frenzy, Ino's husband Athamas killed their son Learchus,⁸⁸ and her panicked response was to snatch her other son from her husband's reach, only to rush over a cliff with him. Without divine intervention, mother and son would have plunged to their deaths.

In short, Ino is well-known for not only suffering but also perpetrating violence, frequently in the course of Bacchic frenzy, but sometimes (in the case of her attack on Phrixus and Helle) in cold blood.⁸⁹ Her dangerous reputation stands no matter how assiduously she cared for her nephew Bacchus after her sister's death and no matter how closely her worship as Mater Matuta is associated with her kourotrophic image as mother of Portunus.⁹⁰ Unlike Anna Perenna, Ino is not an innocent victim who for the most part stood clear of politics and any unsavory acts she might need to commit for political reasons: Ino was born into a royal house, she committed internecine murder against her

⁸⁶ Related by Ovid at *Fasti* 3.853-68, in which Ino is referred to as the *scelerata noverca*. She is also mentioned elliptically at 2.628 as *quae ruricolis semina tosta dedit*, in the context of legendary figures who committed offenses against family members. Additionally, at the end of the Matralia narrative, she is described as *utilior Baccho quam fuit...suis* (6.562). Littlewood (2006) 151-2 notes that "Ino's name was a byword for danger to children." Littlewood 162 also notes the discomfort around the role of the Mater Matuta as protector of maternal aunts, in light of Ino's own role in the death of Pentheus, cf. *Met.* 3.719 where Pentheus begs Ino for mercy.

⁸⁷ *Met.* 3.701-31.

⁸⁸ *Met.* 4.481-519, *Fasti* 6.489-92.

⁸⁹ Another useful point of comparison is Ovid's explanation, related in the course of her festival (*Fasti* 5.551-8) of why a female slave is violently expelled from the Mater Matuta's temple in the course of the festival proceedings: Ino hated female slaves because her husband exploited one for sexual purposes. Again her personality is defined in terms of vindictiveness and bloodthirstiness.

⁹⁰ Parker (1997) in his chapter on Ino notes the two divergent personae that Ovid constructs for Ino in her appearances in the *Fasti*, and claims that Ovid attempts to marry them into a unified personality through narrative sleight-of-hand. I am unconvinced by his argument, which hinges on a line near the end of the Matralia narrative in which a slave with whom Athamas has a sexual relationship discloses that Ino ruined the seeds. Parker takes this as a fabrication by the slave which, as a false claim, is the source of all the evil deeds attributed to Ino in the earlier narrative; however, with no further indication that the earlier episode was false, I am unwilling to assume that a witness' account that supports the earlier narrative (told uncritically in the narrator's voice) is false simply because the witness is a slave whom Athamas is exploiting sexually.

nephew, she was called to account for it. And although Juno's persecution of Ino is cast as irrational and unfounded, Ino is no innocent apolitical figure.

Even despite her checkered history, Ovid's portrayal of Ino is often surprisingly sympathetic.⁹¹ In both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, Ovid describes how Ino was rescued from falling to her death and promises that she will be apotheosed shortly after this disaster; in the *Metamorphoses* she becomes the goddess Leucothoe, whereas in the *Fasti* she becomes the Mater Matuta, a Roman goddess identified as Leucothoe's equivalent. And though Ino was a danger to vulnerable children in her past, the Mater Matuta's festival, marked in the *Fasti* by the story of Ino's apotheosis, is primarily concerned with the protection of children; specifically, it celebrated women's care for their sisters' children.⁹² This fact is explained--although, significantly, never within the Ovidian corpus--via one of the few noble deeds attributed to Ino: she raised her nephew

⁹¹ In fact, within the *Fasti*, Ino's narrative carries a definite suggestion of covering up, disguising, or misdirecting away from some inconvenient background information that she might not want the audience to know (Newlands (1995) 45). Beyond Ino's dodgy history, the audience also sees this whitewashing at 6.650, when Ovid refers to Livia as *sola toro magni digna reperta Iovis*, thus implying that she is an *univira* (the Mater Matuta's festival had particular significance for *univirae*), although she of course had been previously married. As Livia's connubial history is elided, there is a suggestion that, not only is Livia's past being smoothed over for the sake of improving her reputation, but also that Ino is colluding with her in this endeavor, just as Ino's own past is smoothed over. The reader may sense a certain political oiliness and begin to distrust the motives of these women. In fact, Ovid never alludes to Livia's inconvenient history in his work; he conveniently misrepresents Livia to her advantage. In his representation of Ino elsewhere as the *scelerata noverca* despite her sympathetic portrayal here, Ovid seems to complete the statement that he fears to make about Livia herself.

⁹² Parker (1997) elects to separate the Greek from the Roman "manifestation" of Ino within the *Fasti*: "In the former she is portrayed as the archetypal wicked stepmother...but once in Italy she is deemed worthy to be transformed into a Roman goddess" (Parker 37). In my opinion, although the two primary episodes involving Ino in the *Fasti* (the attempted murder of Phrixus and Helle; Ino's apotheosis) radically differ regarding Ino's characterization, I find it somewhat simplistic to claim that two episodes star Ino and the one set in Greece is damning while the one set in Rome is sympathetic. In the first place, the episode of Ino's apotheosis has its setting divided--the first half in Greece, the second in Italy--while it maintains the sympathetic characterization throughout. More importantly, however, Ino is never "deemed worthy" of apotheosis, either in the *Met.* or the *Fasti*: no rationale for Ino's apotheosis is ever offered by Ovid. Ignoring the fact that in the *Met.* Ino is apotheosed before leaving Greece, in the *Fasti* Ino is promised future apotheosis without any explanation behind the honor. I concede that Ovid has constructed separate personalities for Ino in her two major appearances in the *Fasti*, but I do not agree that this difference has geographical origins--nor even that it is dependent upon her apotheosis.

Bacchus and protected him from Juno's jealousy.⁹³ Other characters in both works of poetry express their sympathy for Ino and take steps to alleviate her suffering, seeming to overlook the violent episodes in her past.

In this analysis, it is useful to approach Ovid's *Metamorphoses*⁹⁴ as a base account of the apotheosis of Ino and observe what details Ovid changes when he retells the same story in the *Fasti*.⁹⁵ The story of Ino's apotheosis in Ovid's *Fasti* stands out among Ovid's many apotheosis stories because of this close parallel in the *Metamorphoses* (quite distinct from, for example, Julius Caesar or Romulus in the two works, since those two characters are minimally sketched in one work and expansively elaborated in the other). Despite the initial similarity between these two accounts, however, the *Fasti* version diverges from the other narrative and takes on a unique character.⁹⁶ Significantly, the apotheosis itself does not occur at the dramatic climax at which it does in the *Metamorphoses*, after Ino dramatically races from her home in Greece and jumps off a cliff. On the contrary, Ino is transported to Italy,⁹⁷ and her trials are protracted until the story fizzles out in a promise of future apotheosis--the apotheosis

⁹³ Consider also Leigh's (2000) reading of Ino as a composer of *aretalogiai*, a position that would imbue Ino with a certain degree of power, self-representation, and authority.

⁹⁴ *Met.* 4.513-42.

⁹⁵ *Fasti* 6.481-550.

⁹⁶ Salvadori (1982) 213 points out that the common source material invites the reader to compare one account to the other: "questo comune sfondo mitologico offre la possibilità di un interessante confronto fra la struttura dei due testi."

⁹⁷ The role of Ino as a founding figure who traveled over from the Greek world casts Ino, like Anna Perenna, as a founder parallel to Aeneas (as Desport (1947) 116 puts it, "une sorte de doublet féminin d'Énée"). Indeed, the *Fasti* abounds with Greek founding figures, from Hercules to Evander to Carmentis to Virbius, and it seems odd that these Greek characters are continuously encountering each other in Italy yet meet surprisingly few Italians--notwithstanding Ino's encounter with the maenads. The casting of Ino (to say nothing of Evander and Carmentis) as a Greek colonist suggests that Ino has some lost mythology--that certain Italian societies may have revered the Mater Matuta as their founder and a Greek colonist, but the stories have not come down to us. Unfortunately, this speculation is impossible to prove. Nevertheless, Parker (1997) 51 notes that Ovid is the only classical author to describe Ino's journey to Italy; other authors may equate her with Leucothea but do not elaborate the equivalency.

itself is never reached.⁹⁸ Moreover, although the *Metamorphoses* version of Ino's apotheosis hews close to the Hercules model of other apotheoses in the *Metamorphoses*, the *Fasti* version diverges from this model at critical points. Most notably, in the *Metamorphoses*, apotheosed heroes such as Hercules, Aeneas, Romulus, Julius Caesar, and Ino herself are apotheosed through the intercession of Olympian gods, but Ino in the *Fasti* is not visibly supported by Olympians and instead receives support from minor legendary figures such as the not-yet-apotheosed Hercules and the prophetic nymph Carmentis.⁹⁹ These shifts in the story, I argue, emphasize the fact that "equivalencies" between Greek and Roman deities are not at all simple and direct. While the *Metamorphoses* Ino is essentially a character of Greek myth, the *Fasti* Ino must undergo a substantial transformation from her Greek to her Roman persona.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, the social and political aspects of deification are underlined in Ino's need to campaign for deification and obtain support from the local power figures. I argue that the modification to Ino's story between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* is suggestive of deifications of political leaders contemporary to Ovid and illustrates that for a Roman deity (that is, the Mater Matuta), unlike for a Greek deity (that is, Leucothoe), political and social support from one's contemporaries is just as essential for deification as divine support from Olympians.

In spite of her primary significance as a perpetrator of violence, I will begin by discussing Ino as a victim of violence, beginning with her apotheosis in the

⁹⁸ Salvadori (1982) 214: "Il motivo è comune alle due versioni e segna il momento di più profonda differenziazione, se è vero che nella *Metamorfosi* porta alla rapida conclusione della vicenda (con la divinizzazione di Ino e Melicerta), mentre nei *Fasti* segna l'inizio di un lungo racconto."

⁹⁹ For the structure of Ino's story and its structural similarity to Carmentis' story, see Salvadori 1982, esp. pg. 219-21.

¹⁰⁰ Salvadori (1982) 208 calls attention to the integrative process by which the figure from Greek myth has been assimilated to the Roman goddess.

Metamorphoses. The story of Ino in the *Metamorphoses* follows the Hercules model, in which a mortal is threatened with imminent violence or death and the danger is averted at the last moment. Ino rushes off a cliff into the sea, and before she reaches the water, she is rescued and apotheosed by Neptune, via the advocacy of Venus.

*imminet aequoribus scopulus; pars ima cauatur
fluctibus et tectas defendit ab imbribus undas,
summa riget frontemque in apertum porrigit aequor.
occupat hunc (uires insania fecerat) Ino
seque super pontum nullo tardata timore
mittit onusque suum; percussa recanduit unda.
at Venus immeritae neptis miserata labores
sic patruo blandita suo est: 'o numen aquarum,
proxima cui caelo cessit, Neptune, potestas,
magna quidem posco, sed tu miserere meorum,
iactari quos cernis in Ionio immenso,
et dis adde tuis...'
adnuit oranti Neptunus et abstulit illis
quod mortale fuit maiestatemque uerendam
imposuit nomenque simul faciemque nouauit
Leucothoeque deum cum matre Palaemona dixit.*

A cliff hangs over the sea; the lower part is hollowed out by waves and the covered water is protected from rain, while the upper part is stable and juts out over the open sea. Ino stood here (insanity gave her power), and, not delayed by any fear, she threw herself and her son out over the sea; the waves foamed when struck. But Venus, having pitied the undeserved suffering of her granddaughter, persuaded her uncle thus: "O god of the seas, Neptune, you whose realm is second only to the heavens, I ask a very great favor, but take pity on my family: those people whom you just saw tossed in the Ionian Sea, put them among the gods..." and Neptune gave in to Venus and took away from Ino and Melicertes whatever in them was mortal, and replaced it with formidable majesty, and at once changed their names and their forms, and declared Palaemon a god along with his mother Leucothoe.¹⁰¹

It is interesting, then, that the story has been so heavily restructured in the *Fasti*: the transformative violence that apotheosed Ino in the *Metamorphoses* in the *Fasti* is averted only to preserve her for the sake of further trials.

*arserat obsequio Semele Iovis: accipit Ino
te, puer, et summa sedula nutrit ope.*

¹⁰¹ *Met.* 4.525-36, 539-42.

*intumuit Iuno, raptum quod paelice natum
educet: at sanguis ille sororis erat.
hinc agitur furiis Athamas et imagine falsa,
tuque cadis patria, parve Learchae, manu;
maesta Learchae mater tumulaverat umbras
et dederat miseris omnia iusta rogis.
haec quoque, funestos ut erat laniata capillos,
prosilit et cunis te, Melicerta, rapit.
est spatio contracta brevi, freta bina repellit,
unaque pulsatur, terra, duabus aquis:
huc venit insanis natum complexa lacertis,
et secum celso mittit in alta iugo.
excipit inlaesos Panope centumque sorores,
et placido lapsu per sua regna ferunt.*

Semele had burned due to the consent of Jupiter; Ino took you in as a boy, [Bacchus], and attentively raised you with the greatest care. Juno grew furious, because [Ino] raised the child snatched from the lover [Semele], but they were blood kin. Therefore Athamas was maddened by furies and by a hallucination, and you, Learchus, died by your father's hand. The grieving mother had buried the remains of Learchus and had performed the proper rites at the pyre. She also, after she had rent her distressed hair, jumped up and took you, Melicertes, from your cradle. There was a stretch of land [the Isthmus of Corinth], constricted to a narrow width, that held back the water on both sides, and though the land is singular, it is lashed by two seas: she came forth embracing her child in frenzied arms, and cast him, along with herself, into the deep from a tall cliff. Panope and her hundred sisters caught them unharmed, and they carried them through their realms in a peaceful descent.¹⁰²

In the *Fasti*, the interference of the sea gods¹⁰³ goes some distance to avert Juno's attacks on Ino, but not enough to apotheose her, or even save her from suffering. Although the fall does not kill her, her mortality remains, and, far from gaining a "formidable majesty," she remains vulnerable to violence.¹⁰⁴ In fact, when Ino arrives in

¹⁰² *Fasti* 6.485-500.

¹⁰³ Parker (1997) 70n30 notes the connection to the aid of Portunus and the nymphs including Panopea at *Aen.* 5.240-1; this is another factor connecting Ino to Aeneas as a founder-figure.

¹⁰⁴ Salzman (1998: 322-4) argues that Ino's prolonged suffering in the *Fasti* provides a rationale for her deification that was lacking in the *Met.*, and moreover that this suffering lends a tragic majesty to Ino's narrative that was irreverently missing in the *Met.* I fear that such a conclusion requires one to import Christian ideas of personal suffering as a means to personal salvation that are not necessarily intended in the text as written. While many apotheosed humans do suffer in the course of their achievements on earth (Hercules' *labores* being a prime example), my understanding is that the mortals are apotheosed, as Cicero says, because of their great services to mankind, and any suffering they incur in the process is an unfortunate consequence, unrelated to their ultimate fate. On Stoic ideas of immortality and its causes, cf. Pandey (2013) 417n34, 422n47.

Italy, she is attacked, again at Juno's instigation, by maenads in a frenzy reminiscent of the attacks against Orpheus or Pentheus in the *Metamorphoses*.

*nondum Leucothea, nondum puer ille Palaemon
verticibus densi Thybridis ora tenent.
lucus erat, dubium Semelae Stimulaene vocetur;
maenadas Ausonias incoluisse ferunt:
quaerit ab his Ino quae gens foret. Arcadas esse
audit et Euandrum sceptrum tenere loci;
dissimulata deam Latias Saturnia Bacchas
instimulat fictis insidiosa sonis...
vix bene desierat, complent ululatibus auras
thyiades, effusis per sua colla comis,
iniciuntque manus puerumque revellere pugnant.
quos ignorat adhuc, invocat illa deos:
'dique virique loci, miserae succurrite matri.'
clamor Aventini saxa propinqua ferit.
adpulerat ripae vaccae Oetaeus Hiberas;
audit, et ad vocem concitus urget iter:
Herculis adventu quae vim modo ferre parabant
turpia femineae terga dedere fugae.*

She was not yet Leucothea, and the boy not yet Palaemon, when they looked upon the hills of the reed-choked Tiber. There was a grove--whether it is called the grove of Semele or of Stimula is uncertain--but they say the Italian maenads used to inhabit it. Ino asked them what people they were. She learned that they were Arcadians and that Evander ruled the place; but crafty Juno, having disguised her divinity, roused up the Latian Bacchae with invented stories...scarcely had she stopped, when the maenads filled the air with their howls, with their hair loose upon their necks, and they put their hands on the boy and fought to tear him away. Ino called upon the local gods, whose identities she still did not know: "Gods and men of this place, take pity on a wretched mother!" The sound rang against the nearby rocks of the Aventine. The Oetaen [Hercules] was driving the cattle of Geryon over the riverbank; he heard her, and made his way quickly toward the voice. At the arrival of Hercules, those women who just now were preparing to perpetrate violence showed their shameful backs in womanish flight.¹⁰⁵

As it happens, the *Fasti* never reaches the moment of Ino's apotheosis. After Hercules drives off the aggressive maenads, Carmentis welcomes Ino into her home and prophesies her future apotheosis, but the transformation itself is added as if an afterthought in the final lines of the narrative.

'laeta canam: gaude, defuncta laboribus Ino,'

¹⁰⁵ *Fasti* 6.501-8, 513-22.

*dixit, 'et huic populo prospera semper ades.
 numen eris pelagi: natum quoque pontus habebit.
 in vestris aliud sumite nomen aquis:
 Leucothea Graia, Matuta vocabere nostris;
 in portus nato ius erit omne tuo,
 quem nos Portunum, sua lingua Palaemonia dicet.
 ite, precor, nostris aequus uterque locis.'*
*adnuerat, promissa fides; posuere labores,
 nomina mutarunt: hic deus, illa dea est.*

“I will sing good tidings: rejoice, Ino, now that you have completed your trials,” said [Carmentis], “and you *will* be forever a benefit to this community. You *will* be a sea goddess, and the sea *will* also be the realm of your son; take up a new name from your seas. By the Greeks you will be called Leucothea, and Matuta by us; your son--Portunus to us, Palaemon in his native tongue--will have all powers on the sea. Please, go forth, and each of you be just in our lands.” She assented, and the promise was made; they rested from their trials, and their names changed: he was a god, and she a goddess.¹⁰⁶

In the *Metamorphoses*, then, Ovid has already established Ino's apotheosis to follow a pattern frequently used of other characters such as Hercules: the character is subject to violence and on the brink of death, at which point the character is diverted from death to apotheosis; in the *Fasti*, the same model is applied to Anna Perenna and Julius Caesar, and suggests that the character so saved is exceptionally important and worthy of extraordinary protection from death and suffering. The decision to modify Ino's story in the *Fasti* so it no longer fits this model is deliberate and significant. Ino is hereby changed from someone rescued unharmed by virtue of her inherent status into someone who must suffer and cannot depend on being rescued: her salvation is no longer guaranteed by her identity.

In the *Fasti*, Ino's suffering is exaggerated and drawn out, in comparison to the parallel account in the *Metamorphoses*. In the *Metamorphoses* her fall is quickly averted by Neptune, but in the *Fasti* the fall is never averted, and indeed Ino is able to survive much more violence than would normally be possible (she not only falls off the cliff but

¹⁰⁶ *Fasti* 6.541-50.

survives being dragged through the open water to Italy to endure further abuse from the maenads). The effect is ultimately to highlight the violence that these mortals must endure before being rewarded with apotheosis.

Moreover, Ino's means of gaining salvation in the *Fasti* is particularly loaded. We should immediately note the political aspect of her story. Ino's journey from Greece to Italy¹⁰⁷ is given weight within the narrative, as Ino is forced to adapt herself to an unfamiliar setting and population, just as Anna Perenna suffers in her lack of power until she sufficiently adapts to her Italian setting via apotheosis. With difficulty she wins over the local populace and enlists them to support her against Juno's attacks; in particular the narrator stresses Ino's unfriendly initial reception by the Italian maenads, in whom Juno stirs up hostility toward Ino on the basis that she is a foreigner and uninitiated in their rites. On sight, they cry out against her.

*'non venit haec nostris hospes amica choris.
fraude petit, sacrique parat cognoscere ritum.'*

"This woman does not come to our assembly as a friendly outsider; she seeks us with deception, and she prepares to spy out our sacred rituals."¹⁰⁸

Ino's initial rejection by the Italian maenads is mitigated by her alliance with Hercules, hero of worldly experience and universal fame, who recognizes that both he and Ino are being persecuted by a common enemy (Juno), and for this reason he lends her his support. Later on, Ino is received by Carmentis, who also becomes one of Ino's allies by providing Ino with hospitality and foretelling that Ino and her son will be apotheosed. Even then, there is a sense that Ino is covertly seeking refuge at Carmentis' house and that her position is not openly known. Ino will not be fully accepted in Italy until she and

¹⁰⁷ One may compare the transfer of Aesculapius' cult to Italy in the *Met.* 15.622-744.

¹⁰⁸ *Fasti* 6.510-1.

her son adapt themselves to the locality and further transform themselves into the Mater Matuta and Portunus. There is a clear sense of the necessity to form alliances against powerful enemies and to adopt the proper customs and rhetoric in order to gain acceptance (and thereby power) in any given society, and Ino, despite her initial difficulties, is accepted by the locals in the end.

The choice of setting at the Grove of Stimula is also significant. Bömer, Littlewood, and Frazer all point out that its Bacchic associations are not limited to the similarity between the names Stimula and Semele: the Grove of Stimula was the setting for the scandalous Bacchic orgies of 186 BCE that were eventually banned by the S. C. *de Bacchanalibus*, as described in Livy 39.9-17.¹⁰⁹ The reference to this grove as a site for Bacchic rites should not be surprising, since Ovid has proven throughout the *Fasti* to be a devoted reader of Livy.¹¹⁰ The grove's notoriety as a disreputable and menacing place where dangerous things might happen at the instigation of Bacchus--or at least at the instigation of worshippers who lose control of themselves in the frenzy of worship--works much to Ovid's advantage as he hints at Ino's discomfort in this foreign setting and the latent threat embodied by the women she encounters. The *Lucus Stimulae* is one of many locations in the *Fasti* evocative of what Rea describes as "'archaic-Augustan Rome,' a site that juxtaposed elements from Rome's earliest foundations with the buildings of the contemporary city." In Rea's estimation, poetic visions of archaic-

¹⁰⁹ Cf. the bronze inscription recording the text of the S. C., *CIL* i² 2.581, although this inscription does not mention the location of the offending rites. The location of the *Lucus Stimulae* is not attested by any known archaeological remains, although its location is described in vague terms in Livy 39.12-3, and a surviving funerary inscription (*CIL* 6.9897) refers to the *Lucus Semeles*. Many sources give tentative descriptions of its location (e.g. Platner (1929) s.v. "*Lucus Stimulae*"; Littlewood (2006) 159; Frazer (1929) s.v. 6.503); Wiseman (2004) in his Figure 1 appears to be the only one bold enough to mark it on a map. Note that Wiseman places it on the north side of the Aventine, whereas Platner and Frazer definitely put it on the southwest or west side.

¹¹⁰ For the Augustan-era interest in the legendary past, and the effort to make these legends more immediate to the present, see Rea (2007) 6.

Augustan Rome “would, in effect, allow the Romans to recall that Rome had endured and even flourished, in spite of the strife that had tainted its foundations.”¹¹¹ Here the *Lucus Stimulae* leans on this significance as a location, identifiable in contemporary Rome and familiar to Ovid’s audience, is imbued with a menacing air by the women who threaten Ino, even though the audience has been reassured of Ino’s future apotheosis.

There is a certain degree of irony in the fact that Ino, whose most praiseworthy accomplishment is her sedulous rearing of her nephew Bacchus, is threatened by those who venerate Bacchus and presumably owe some debt of gratitude to the woman who raised him. This fact stresses the ineffable aspect of Bacchus and the danger that even his staunchest mortal supporters incur by any interaction with him. Bacchus may motivate his followers to perpetrate any number of atrocities (witness the fact that Ino herself participated in the murder of Pentheus in the *Metamorphoses*), even when his followers may not wish to be perpetrators of such violence. Indeed, the jarring reversal of Ino’s place in Bacchus’ worship--from committing violence on his behalf to being threatened with violence by his worshippers--seems frighteningly dissonant to her promised apotheosis as the *Mater Matuta*. It creates suspense within the story of how the established conclusion--her apotheosis--will be reached in light of these not-very-promising circumstances. When Ino summons aid from the power figures in the area, she shows her wherewithal to survive on the strength of her social connections.

After all the suffering she endures, the reader might assume that Ino’s apotheosis is the end of her troubles. Nevertheless, in the *Metamorphoses*, despite her apotheosis, Ino has a surprisingly difficult *Nachleben*. Her family, the narrator reveals, never learns

¹¹¹ Rea (2007) 4-5.

of her apotheosis, and goes into mourning for her.¹¹² For her parents Cadmus and Harmonia, this is the last in a long string of tragedies, and they mourn so deeply that they turn into snakes. In the *Fasti* the narrative at least provides a reason why Ino's family might have been unaware of her transformation: she was transported to Italy and apotheosed there, and the news might not have reached her family. Nevertheless, as discussed above, more troubles are piled onto her before she can be apotheosed. In the *Metamorphoses* there is a strong implication that she is continually plagued by problems even after her narrative ends, just as in the *Fasti* she is left assured of her apotheosis without reaching the event itself. Despite the sympathy the narrator shows for her, the unsatisfying endings to each version of her story hint that Ino is not entirely deserving of a happy ending. On the other hand, there is an interesting contrast between the endings of these two versions, one of which ends with those close to her revealing their ignorance of her completed apotheosis, and the other of which ends with those close to her revealing their knowledge of her future apotheosis.

At its core, Ino's experience in both Greece and Italy evokes the idea of mortals being vulnerable before gods. Juno, of course, has a history in Latin literature as irrationally sadistic and vindictive against the mortals (such as Aeneas or Hercules) at whom she takes offense, often through no fault of their own.¹¹³ It is hardly surprising that Juno should select Ino for punishment when she similarly persecuted Callisto, Aeneas, or Hercules--a connection that Hercules himself mentions to Ino. Even so, Juno is not the only god who causes pain and suffering for Ino. In Thebes Ino loses several family

¹¹² *Met.* 4.545-8, 563-70. Tissol (2002) 335 cites a parallel for Hersilia mourning Romulus, apparently unaware that he's been apotheosed: "Hersilia supposes Romulus 'lost'...and evidently knows nothing yet of his apotheosis--certainly nothing about her own."

¹¹³ Parker (1999) 340: "Like Aeneas, [Ino] is punished by Hera because of her associations rather than for anything she has actually done."

members, including Semele, Pentheus, and her son Learchus,¹¹⁴ to intentionally or unintentionally violent encounters with a number of Olympians. When Ino is attacked upon arrival in Italy in the grove of Semele by a group of maenads, there is a strong suggestion that association with Bacchus is inherently dangerous, and that Bacchus is too chaotic to be entertained safely by mortals. Even Ino, who raised Bacchus, is not protected from his worshippers.¹¹⁵ In this case, however, the violence latent in the maenads in the Grove of Stimula is motivated not by Bacchus, but by Juno--apparently the Bacchic set-dressing is merely a red herring. And in the end, Ino does not fall victim to a tragedy parallel to those of Pentheus, Orpheus, or the nebulous victims who prompted the writing of the *S. C. de Bacchanalibus*. She is rescued by Hercules and received by Carmentis, and the threat is replaced by hospitality.

With the appearance of the not-yet-apotheosed Hercules, we return to Hercules's apotheosis in the *Metamorphoses* as a model for other apotheoses in Ovid. His apotheosis is the first and most lengthy of the five major apotheosis narratives in the *Metamorphoses*, and as such, can serve as an *exemplum* for Ino's apotheosis. There is a certain degree of circularity to this idea, since Ino's apotheosis was also narrated in the *Metamorphoses*, four books before that of Hercules--in other words, the Ino of the *Metamorphoses* is serving as a template not only for Hercules in the *Metamorphoses*, but also for herself in the *Fasti*. When they meet in the *Fasti*, neither Hercules nor Ino has yet been apotheosed, but Hercules' apotheosis is cast as so imminent as to be, in practical

¹¹⁴ The circumstances under which Athamas kills Learchus--a fit of insanity in which he mistakes him for a wild animal--is much more evocative of Bacchus' influence (via Euripides' *Bacchae*) than Juno's. Hardie (1990) sees this episode of Juno imitating Bacchus (or rather, the parallel episode in the *Met.*) as a reflection of the *Aeneid* and Amata's put-on Bacchic frenzy in service of Juno; in which case, Ovid may have chosen this course of events for the *Met.* and decided not to alter it when he told the same story in the *Fasti*.

¹¹⁵ Parker (1999) 342: "One might think that if Ino were to be welcomed anywhere, it would be here among a group of women devoted to her nephew and stepson, Bacchus."

terms, already accomplished: recall that Ino is specified to call upon the *gods and men* of the place, but only Hercules comes to answer her call, presumably because he fits into either category. On the other hand, now that Ino's apotheosis narrative has diverged from its model in the *Metamorphoses*, the reader may be in doubt as to whether it will play out as expected. It is important, also, to incorporate questions of status and deference into this discussion of Ino's story as a political episode, since competition for political power became so vicious at the end of the republican era.¹¹⁶ While Hercules and Ino are nominally on level in terms of status, both being mortals, Hercules is clearly more powerful, more prestigious, and more assured of his divine status in the future. He takes Ino under his protection and consoles her. When she seeks shelter with Carmentis, the reader must presume that Hercules was the one who directed her to that refuge.

*'quid petis hinc', (cognorat enim) 'matertera Bacchi?
an numen, quod me, te quoque vexat?' ait.
illa docet partim, partim praesentia nati
continet, et furiis in scelus isse pudet.
Rumor, ut est velox, agitatis pervolat alis,
estque frequens, Ino, nomen in ore tuum.
hospita Carmentis fidos intrasse penates
diceris...*

"What are you seeking here, aunt of Bacchus?" [Hercules] asked, for he had already recognized her. "Does the goddess who torments me [Juno] do the same to you?" She told him part of the story, but part she suppressed due to the presence of her son, for it shamed her to have transgressed into crime, even under the influence of madness. Rumor, being swift, flew on beating wings, and your name, Ino, was commonly heard. You are said to have entered the faithful home of Carmentis as a guest...¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ The impression of Hercules as a Roman politician is subtly enhanced by the unelaborated, but implicitly understood, reason why Hercules is in Italy in the first place: he is returning to Greece from his mission to capture the cattle of Geryon. Fox (1996) 78-9 describes how historians such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus cast this escapade much like the triumphant return of a victorious Roman general to Italy. There is also an implied parallel between Hercules, various Roman generals, and the other world-traveling victorious conqueror mentioned in this narrative: Bacchus, nursling of Ino.

¹¹⁷ *Fasti* 6.523-30.

Hercules, in short, is a powerful ally to Ino and steps up to aid her in her uncertain ascent to divinity. Presumably the in-narrative explanation of why he is able to tutor her in this way is because he has spent more time in Italy than she has and has performed services for the locals,¹¹⁸ though the metaliterary implication seems to be that he knows more about being a god because, after all, he is a major Roman god--at least to Ovid's readers, if not yet within the narrative.

Within the *Metamorphoses*, it is also useful to consider Ino's story in light of parallel *exempla* that she (and the reader) has the opportunity to observe. These various tragic *exempla* are instructive enough that Ino is thereby trained to avoid a similar fate for herself: her story is introduced by the story of Semele, who was successfully beguiled and destroyed by Juno; Ino observes and learns from this *exemplum* and is able to survive Juno's persecution. Similarly, Ino's less fortunate son Learchus was killed by her mortal husband Athamas (while he was temporarily insane); Ino witnesses this violence, also the product of Juno's persecution, and is thus able to save her other son from Juno's attacks. Having learned from these *exempla*, Ino rushes to save herself and her son from further violence by throwing herself and her son into the sea; in a move to rescue the pair from Juno's violence, sea deities transport them to Italy. This is apparently in contradiction to the account of their apotheosis in the *Metamorphoses*, in which they are apotheosed the moment they jump off the cliff without an Italian interlude.

Here again I will call attention to the chronological arrangement of the *Fasti* and the achronological, eternal perception of events: because the events are arranged in the order in which they are commemorated in the contemporary calendar and not in the historical order in which they occurred, the reader can come away with the sense that all

¹¹⁸ As related at *Aen.* 8.193-272.

the events take place within some eternal present, and that, in this case, Hercules' apotheosis is an undateable, inevitable fact that is apparent at all points in his adventures. The achronological aspect is enhanced by the fact that, when Hercules enters the story, he is referred to not by name, but by the epithet *Oetaeus*, an epithet that refers to no aspect of Hercules' identity except his death: Oeta is where Hercules will set up his funeral pyre and where his mortal body will be burned away, completing his transition to divinity. For this reason, *Oetaeus* should not be a meaningful identifier of Hercules with respect to any past accomplishments of his at this point in the narrative; it is only meaningful if the reader already knows his future. Of course, the proleptic reference to his apotheosis becomes loaded with further meaning insofar as the encounter between *Oetaus* and Ino is embedded within this extended version of Ino's transition to divinity--when, according to the *Metamorphoses*' account, Ino ought to have been transformed into a goddess already--as Hercules' apotheosis is rendered indisputable by the narrator. He instructs Ino in how to be a god because he is well-versed in this area; the question of when he acquires this experience is irrelevant. Hercules, of course, appears many times within the *Fasti*, whereas Ino is only a character in this one episode; the timeless aspect of Hercules' character is much stronger than that of Ino, and for that reason Ino's identity in this episode, to a greater extent than Hercules', is invested in her progression from mortal to divine; while Hercules is inevitably a (future) god in his every appearance, Ino's character does not bear that same strength of inevitability. Her personal narrative maintains more suspense, her narrative is more embedded in time, and her status as divine is more a matter of question, for which reason Hercules is treated as a loftier personage.

I must return to the reference I made above to the “five major apotheosis narratives” from the *Metamorphoses*, those of Hercules, Aeneas, Romulus, and Julius Caesar.¹¹⁹ These narratives are frequently discussed in concert because they are clustered near the end of the work, they all follow the same model in which an Olympian sponsors the character in question for apotheosis, and the characters apotheosed have significance to Roman political history and ideology, particularly as illustrated in literature contemporary to Ovid. These five episodes work together to build a meta-narrative of the religio-political trajectory of Augustan Rome. All five characters serve as founding figures for Rome and are named as the founders of specific monuments. What links their five apotheoses together is the divine sponsorship behind each one: each of these heroes has an established Olympian god or goddess campaigning on his behalf, on whose advice the hero is diverted from Hades to Olympus. The *Metamorphoses* contains a handful of other transformations that can be pointed out as apotheoses--the catasterism of Callisto, for example, or the transformations of Hippolytus or Aesculapius, or the sudden transformations of Acis, Io, and Glaucus--but Ovid passes over these quickly or in ambiguous terms. Ino’s transformation stands out awkwardly in the *Metamorphoses* because she does not seem aligned with either category: she is not a figure of great literary or historical importance whose apotheosis has remarkable political significance in the Augustan age, but still her elevation to the role of a powerful goddess is detailed clearly and at length, and endorsed by a goddess with great significance both to the Julio-Claudians and to Ovid himself. This implies that the apotheosis of Ino has greater political significance than most scholars assume. The reappearance of Ino’s narrative in the *Fasti*, even with the course of the narrative altered and expanded, stresses her

¹¹⁹ Refer back to my discussion of this model at the beginning of this chapter.

importance to Ovid, and urges the reader to look on Mater Matuta as an influential member of the pantheon, on par with Quirinus, Deus Indiges, Hercules, and Divus Julius.

As in the case of Romulus, I would return to the question of mortals as instigators of violence and how they might be transformed in consequence. Ino has little to recommend her for apotheosis--it seems a curious *non sequitur* that Venus, Neptune, and the nymphs so unhesitatingly advocate for her apotheosis when the *Fasti* has just shown her watch Athamas murder Learchus. In the *Metamorphoses* she is shown to murder her nephew, and shortly after participate in a *folie à deux* with Athamas to attack their sons. The active violence she displays in the one, along with her passive tolerance of violence in the other, demonstrates that these acts apparently give Venus and Neptune no pause in the question of whether they should save her from death: clearly she is not being rewarded for a life of righteousness, nor (as Cicero's Scipio claims in the *de Re Publica*) for great service to the state. In fact, we should ask whether her perpetration of violence positively contributes to the gods' decision to apotheose her, as is implied to be the case for Romulus regarding the Sabine Rape. Restricting discussion to the *Fasti*, one should remember that Ino's apotheosis is not directly narrated, so we do not see, for example, Venus speaking on Ino's behalf of all the reasons why she should be apotheosed. Because there is so little evidence directly linking Ino's apotheosis to any other event in the *Fasti*, any causal link drawn would be highly tenuous. Nevertheless, the perpetration of violence is such an intrinsic part of Ino's character that it must be taken into consideration when she is apotheosed.

I would like to return to my premise, namely that there is a relationship in the *Fasti* between violence and apotheosis to the effect that one necessarily requires the

other. This idea is complicated in the case of Ino and Melicertes, particularly in light of Ovid's contrastive treatment in the *Metamorphoses*. In that account, Juno's frenzy descended upon Ino, her husband killed her other son, she threw herself and her son over a cliff, and that froth of violence precipitated their transformation to sea deities. In the *Fasti*, those two events have been separated from each other, and while the intervention of the sea deities averts Ino's death and prevents the narrative from ending in irrevocable violence, the reader must ask why the neat dovetailing of violence and transformation has been removed and the model that works so well for other accounts in the *Fasti* has been thereby disrupted. The answer seems to lie in the recasting of Ino as *not merely* Ino but the Mater Matuta also, for which reason she is required to travel to Italy to establish her Italian identity before her trials can end.

Apotheosis in Ovid's poetry is a highly variable process and can follow a number of different models depending on who is being apotheosed and in what circumstances. More than anything, Ino's apotheosis story in the *Fasti* stands out as a non-apotheosis, one in which the reader could be expected to recall the parallel account from the *Metamorphoses* and anticipate it to play out much the same way, only to be mystified when Ino's apotheosis never arrives. Her story is substantially altered, and she is transported and acculturated to Italy as an important part of her apotheosis. In patently controverting his other account, Ovid sets the *Fasti* Ino apart from her counterpart in the *Metamorphoses* as not just a player in the Theban saga but a Roman goddess in her own right, one who has been transformed not just from mortal to immortal but from Greek to Roman. Her role in Roman religion as the subject of cult and honoree of the Matralia is central to her significance in the *Fasti*, but moreover is something that she could not have

achieved without the support of local Italian power figures. While the *Metamorphoses* Ino might have become Leucothoe passively, having been rescued from trials through the intervention of Venus, the *Fasti* Ino cannot become the Mater Matuta without enduring the trials and acquiring the support of her contemporaries. She is a social goddess.

Triptolemus

As a final example, I would call attention to a character who is only briefly mentioned but nevertheless illuminates Ovid's conventions for apotheoses in the *Fasti*. The story of Persephone's abduction, as I will discuss in chapter three, provides little detail regarding how the abduction changed Persephone's life or status; her promotion to Queen of the Underworld may have (as in the case of Flora) rendered her a more powerful goddess, but if so, the details of her transformation are not elucidated for the audience. Nevertheless, this story does contain an attempted apotheosis in which some degree of detail is provided: while Ceres is staying with Celeus and Metanira, she attempts to transform their infant son Triptolemus into an immortal, although the process is interrupted and thus foiled by Metanira.

*noctis erat medium placidique silentia somni:
Triptoleмум gremio sustulit illa suo,
terque manu promulsit eum, tria carmina dixit,
carmina mortali non referenda sono,
inque foco corpus pueri vivente favilla
obruit, humanum purget ut ignis onus.
excutitur somno stulte pia mater, et amens
'quid facis?' exclamat, membraque ab igne rapit.
cui dea 'dum non es,' dixit 'scelerata fuisti:
inrita materno sunt mea dona metu.
iste quidem mortalis erit: sed primus arabit*

et seret et culta praemia tollet humo.’

It was the middle of the night, and all around was the silence of peaceful sleep. [Ceres] lifted Triptolemus from her lap. Three times she stroked him with her hand, and she recited three spells, spells which may not be repeated by a mortal voice. Then she placed the boy’s body in the fireplace amid the live embers, so the fire would eliminate the mortal dross. His well meaning but foolish mother awoke and frantically cried, “What are you doing?” and she snatched the body from the flames. To her the goddess said, “Although you did not intend to, you have done irreparable harm, and my services are all wasted because of your maternal fear. This child will be mortal after all, but at least he will be the first to plow and plant the land, and to gain the produce of agriculture.”¹²⁰

Here we have many of the same elements known from the Hercules model. Triptolemus has a divine sponsor (Ceres) who intends to apotheose him. When Ceres enters the narrative, Triptolemus may be subject to an external threat to his life, since he is described as *aeger* in line 4.529, and Ovid implies that Ceres’ care is what cures him. Nevertheless, Ceres’ process of rescuing him from this initial illness is not a bid for immortality. The operative violence that is provided as a vehicle for apotheosis appears when Ceres places him in the fire in attempt to burn away his mortality. Here the destructive force of the fire, which Fantham identifies as a purifying element,¹²¹ is portrayed as essential to the process of apotheosis, so much so that when the violent action is cut off (Metanira removes him from the fire), so is his path to divinity. Triptolemus is not threatened by violence from a hostile or accidental source as Ino or Anna Perenna is, but Ceres herself initiates the violence. This sequence of events is further evidence that this suffering is critical to the process of apotheosis. Unfortunately, the process is ultimately unsuccessful, and Triptolemus is not apotheosed, although Ceres’ last two lines specify that he will have a heroic life, even if he is not immortal.

Ceres’ attempt to burn away Triptolemus’ mortality with fire recalls Hercules’ apotheosis in the *Metamorphoses*, in which the fire destroys the mortal element of

¹²⁰ *Fasti* 4.549-60.

¹²¹ Fantham (1998) 196-7.

Hercules' body and only the immortal part remains.¹²² Hercules in his case has already been subjected to violence from an external, accidental source in the form of the poisoned shirt sent by Deianira. His decision to immolate himself is an attempt to escape the intense pain of the burning poison, but, because a divine sponsor steps in, it becomes a vehicle to apotheosis. Although the violence in the form of fire is instrumental to his apotheosis, it is not performed for that reason. In Triptolemus' case the burning is imposed by Ceres for the specific purpose of apotheosis, illustrating the fact that, although Hercules' immolation might have seemed incidental to his apotheosis, it in fact was essential.

It is worth noting that, in Ovid's account of Persephone's rape in the *Metamorphoses*, Ceres makes no attempt to immortalize a child. She has a brief hospitality encounter with mortals,¹²³ but it ends with a punitive transformation when she turns an ill-mannered child into a lizard. The apotheosis story nevertheless has a well known forerunner in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, in which Demeter likewise takes up a post as a nurse in a mortal household and decides to apotheose the baby.¹²⁴ In the Greek version, the events are related in much greater detail, and Ovid's retelling reads as a summary of the more detailed version. The little attention that Ovid accords to this story makes it difficult to address thoroughly, but it is nevertheless significant because the reader can see clearly illustrated the necessity of suffering in the process of apotheosis.

Conclusion

¹²² *Met.* 9.262-72.

¹²³ *Met.* 5.446-61.

¹²⁴ *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 212-74.

After having established a common model for apotheosis stories in the *Metamorphoses*—the threat of violence, followed by the sponsorship and intervention of a god--Ovid engages this model, but seldom replicates it, when describing the process of apotheosis in the *Fasti*. Anna Perenna follows the model quite well, since she is put in mortal danger by Lavinia's henchmen and is only rescued by the river god's intervention. Nevertheless, Anna was placed in substantial danger many times before her salvation by Numicius, and the prolonging of her crisis creates substantial dramatic tension. Julius Caesar is likewise threatened with assassination, and Vesta steps in to save him, crucially replacing the man himself with a phantom—although it could appear to ordinary witnesses that Caesar was assassinated, in fact he was rescued from death before he was killed. Ino's story carries the suggestion of this model, particularly if the reader is familiar with the version from the *Metamorphoses*, but no matter how many times she is put in mortal danger, she does not find the relief of apotheosis; it is only promised to her in the future. Triptolemus is subjected to violence in the process of his attempted apotheosis, but the violence is inflicted by the goddess who was apotheosing him.

Each of these characters has been substantially reshaped by Ovid from previous accounts and adapted to the role of being a particularly Italian deity. In the case of Anna Perenna and Ino, they are physically brought to Italy and acculturated before they are apotheosed; they meet allies in Italy and make connections to particular locations. Julius Caesar's story is altered from the parallel account in the *Metamorphoses* in terms of which god sponsors his apotheosis, and the sponsoring goddess (Vesta) is a deity essential to the Roman state religion. Moreover, his role in the *Fasti* has been drastically pared down from his role in the *Metamorphoses*, and most of the praise heaped on him in

the *Metamorphoses* is forgotten in the *Fasti*, creating a sense that Ovid is weighing the potential consequences of writing about Caesar much more so than he troubled to do when composing the *Metamorphoses*. Triptolemus, having been described under a different name in the *Homeric Hymn* but omitted from the *Metamorphoses*, is reinstated in the *Fasti* version and presented as a hero, although he has no particular connection to Italy. The marked alterations to these characters' stories in contrast to other accounts highlight their process of being adopted into Roman culture.

The Hercules model is clearly critical background to reading the many apotheosis narratives in the *Fasti*. Further variations and sub-models are also apparent, however, and these will be presented in the following chapters.

CHAPTER 2

REMUS AND ROMULUS: A DIVIDED HERCULES

Having established an expected model for apotheosis narratives in the *Fasti*, we can turn to Romulus specifically, who represents an exceptional case within these expectations. Romulus, of course, is a celebrated character from Roman legend who appears as a character in essentially every account of Roman history; when describing Romulus, Ovid is reworking legends that every Roman ought to know, and his particular decisions in shaping Romulus' story are sharply defined against the background of other accounts. In the *Fasti*, Romulus is easily one of the most frequently recurring and most important characters: he holds center stage as the heir to the Alban Kings, one of the twins miraculously saved from exposure by a wolf, the founder elected by the gods, and the establisher of ancient customs.¹ His appearances begin with the invocation of Romulus at the beginning of book 1, and continue (in order of appearance) with the syncrisis between Romulus and Augustus, the twins' contest to thwart the cattle rustlers, the twins' exposure, Romulus' appearance to Julius Proculus, the rape of Rhea Silvia, Romulus' role in the abduction of the Sabine Women, the death of Remus, and the

¹ I find it particularly significant that Romulus is such a prominent character in the *Fasti* when he is entirely absent from the other exilic works. It suggests that Ovid found Romulus to be too volatile a subject to include in his later works.

reappearance of Remus' ghost.² This effusion of description of Romulus' life and times is a substantial departure from the depiction of Romulus in the *Metamorphoses*,³ in which Romulus' exploits are skimmed over as Ovid rushes to narrate his apotheosis;⁴ it also marks the *Fasti*'s Romulus out as one of the few apotheosed mortals in the works of Ovid who is observable as an active character, not merely a pawn of the gods. The reader may take this disjointed biography as an encomium of Romulus' deeds and consequently justification for his apotheosis--depending on how praiseworthy the reader finds his deeds.

Nevertheless, in that endeavor, the reader may find it extraordinarily difficult to develop any consistent, overarching judgment of Romulus' character in the *Fasti*.⁵ He appears as the quintessential symbol of *Romanitas* and the definitive model of all things Roman, occasionally even a paragon of the simple bucolic life that is idealized in Roman literature.⁶ As such, he is held up as a paragon for all Romans, even Augustus, to emulate.⁷ Nevertheless, in the same work, he is shown as brash and unsophisticated, the boorish peasant shepherd who lived in a hut and was shunned by all his neighbors when he sought wives for his citizens, a benchmark to show how far Roman society had

² The main Romulus episodes in the *Fasti* appear at: 2.361-78, 2.383-422, 2.481-512, 3.9-78, 3.179-234, 4.809-858, and 5.451-80. The major episodes in which Romulus figures as a character in the *Fasti* are aggregated into a table by Barchiesi (1997) on pg. 154, followed by a discussion of the unexpected order and placement of the episodes.

³ Cf. Gosling (2002) 53: "Ovid plays on both the similarities and the differences in his two accounts, and expects his readers to construct a different Romulus through synthesis of apparent contradictions."

⁴ Tissol (2002) 328 on the *Metamorphoses*: "Ovid's approach to Romulus is no approach at all: he omits the founder's exploits and shifts all attention to the divine sphere."

⁵ Stok's analysis of "l'Ambiguo Romolo dei *Fasti*" is enlightening on this subject.

⁶ Rea (2007) 126-8 discusses Romulus as a model of rustic Roman economy, although she argues that Ovid depicts Romulus as degraded rather than ennobled by his poverty.

⁷ Barchiesi (1997) 141-4 remarks on the importance of Romulus in the *Fasti*, particularly as a spiritual ancestor of Augustus and as such an important proponent of the city of Rome.

progressed.⁸ When Romulus repeatedly crops up throughout the *Fasti*, always illustrating a different episode of his life, he becomes so overloaded with different meanings that it is not useful to apply a single, reductive characterization to every appearance of Romulus in the *Fasti*. His significance to the Augustan program was key to Ovid's depiction of him in this way;⁹ Romulus as the founder was an example for Augustus to follow, a just and farsighted ruler, but simultaneously he must be someone whom Augustus can surpass, and as such is cast as deficient and inadequate when compared to Augustus directly. His portrait seems to be both carefully composed and unevenly edited:¹⁰ every individual episode works toward a pointed characterization, but the episodes have not been harmonized with one another, so the composite portrait appears incoherent. When he must be all Romuluses to all people, it is unsurprising that Romulus does not fit the Hercules Model, or any consistent model.

In my analysis of Romulus in the *Fasti*, I would like to avoid taking a stance in the much-debated question of whether and when and to what degree Ovid's Romulus serves as a metaphor for Augustus. Many scholars have tackled this question, a question that is complicated by the many appearances of Romulus in the *Fasti*, but in my opinion the results still lie in the realm of speculation. In certain respects and in certain episodes, comparisons between Ovid's Romulus and Augustus (or Julius Caesar) are unavoidable, but over the course of the entire work, Romulus is not presented overtly and consistently

⁸ For the tension between the differing depictions of Romulus in the *Fasti*, particularly in how it affects Augustus, see Beard (1987), esp. pg. 8-9. Ogilvie (1965) 54 notes a similar tension between the "bad" Romulus and the "good" Romulus in Livy.

⁹ For Ovid's conception of Roman history and identity and the ways these ideas are mapped and envisioned in his works, see Lindheim (2010).

¹⁰ Many have addressed the unfinished aspect of the *Fasti*, but on this subject see especially Johnson (1978). McKeown (1984) also notes the *Fasti*'s inconsistency in tone and remarks upon how Ovid might speak with a jovial tone when describing Anna Perenna's festival, only to change to deadly earnestness when describing the apotheosis of Caesar in the following lines.

as a stand-in for Augustus; he is his own character. McKeown in his article “*Fabula Proposito Nulla Tegenda Meo*” has argued (rightly, in my opinion) that although the *Fasti* has interludes of political significance, it is not principally a political work, and that its interpretation is done a disservice by foregrounding the political element. For that reason I will be focusing on the construction of Romulus within the narrative and limiting comparisons to Augustus or other real-life individuals.

In spite of this generally inconsistent depiction of Romulus, one aspect that becomes consistently clear (and idiosyncratically Ovidian) is the fact that his violent and disreputable aspects shown in Ovid’s predecessors are muted in, or excised from, the *Fasti*. While Ovid frequently references his predecessors (most particularly Livy) in his accounts of Romulus, for those familiar with these predecessors, a distinct refashioning of the characterization of Romulus is evident: Romulus’ stories have all been bowdlerized, reframed, and reedited in order to remove violence from the episodes and present Romulus as less inclined to dish out or provoke violence than he is in previous accounts.¹¹ This process is most evident in the interpolation of Celer into the murder of Remus,¹² the ostentatious acquittal of Romulus in Remus’ death by Remus’ ghost,¹³ and

¹¹ Evans (1992) 93-5 discusses Romulus as being “rehabilitated” by the Julio-Claudians and their client poets: “The rehabilitation of the Romulus myth, which had to be done obliquely because of the pointed remarks that could be (and were) made about fratricide and the enmity of the Senate, began with Caesar, to be carried on by Augustus...there is also evidence that the poets sought to follow Augustus’ lead and ‘rehabilitate’ Romulus, because they understood how important such propaganda was to the princeps.” Stok (1991) 184 speaks of “il richiamo alla figura di Romolo” in the lifetime of Augustus and states that “La censura del *parricidium* originario e la conseguente revisione della figura di Romolo, in ottemperanza all’ideologia dinastica del principe, è testimoniata massicciamente ed inequivocabilmente nella letteratura impegnata dell’età augustea.”

¹² Stok (1991) 187: “A prescindere dalle fonti specifiche che Ovidio potrebbe aver utilizzato, la versione che i *Fasti* propongono del mito della fondazione di Roma è apparsa nel complesso aderente alle esigenze dell’ideologia dinastica augustea.” Discussion of such matters in scholarship (see esp. Feeney (1992)) inevitably turns to Ovid’s political motivations for doing so, and his attempts to either bolster or undermine Augustus as the new Romulus. Nevertheless, Ovid’s motivations, political or otherwise, for reshaping Romulus’ biography this way, and Augustus’ supposed reactions to them, is irrelevant to my point here.

Proculus Julius' swift denial of the rumor that Romulus was murdered. The effect of this process is to make Romulus an admirable model for leadership, in most cases unassailable, but for Augustus' purposes, only a benchmark that he is slated to surpass.

Without question, Ovid's depiction of Romulus in the *Fasti* is complicated. Much work on the construction of Romulus as a literary figure has been done by T. P. Wiseman in his book *Remus*, and the role of Romulus within the *Fasti* has been extensively analyzed by Alessandro Barchiesi, Stephen Hinds, and Anne Gosling. In this chapter my primary objective is to discover what degree of causation lies between the role of violence in Romulus' life and his eventual apotheosis, as described in the *Fasti*. Despite Ovid's consistent process of scaling back the violence and removing it from Romulus' life, some violent episodes still remain, and even if they do not attach blame to Romulus, they still have negative consequences for people close to him. A noteworthy example is Rhea Silvia, and the violence she suffers (or rather does not suffer) will be examined later in this chapter. More prominently, however, the violence in Romulus' life affects Remus as an unfortunate victim, someone who might not have suffered so much had he had a different brother. In fact, I argue that, within the *Fasti*, Romulus and Remus are for certain purposes elided into one entity, to the extent that Remus' suffering can be read as the precedent violence necessary for Romulus' apotheosis in the expected Hercules Model.¹⁴

At this point I must note the 'martyrizing effect' that will be more fully elaborated at the end of chapter three. In the Hercules Model, an apotheosed mortal is rescued by

¹³ The ambiguity of Romulus' character and Remus' murder is amusingly illustrated in the index of Wiseman and Wiseman's 2011 translation of the *Fasti*, in which, under the heading "Remus," one citation is labeled "Killed by Celer," the next is "Blames Romulus," and the next is "Doesn't blame Romulus."

¹⁴ For a discussion of Romulus and Remus as a complementary pair in the *Fasti*, see Drossart (1972), although Drossart is more inclined to read the *Fasti*'s Romulus as depicted in a consistently positive way.

means of apotheosis from an imminent threat, often of mortal danger. This danger and suffering can be extended, as in the case of Ino or Anna Perenna (discussed in the preceding chapter), beyond a single transformative episode and made into an ongoing process; in these cases, apotheosis is the final, definitive relief from extensive trials. This convention of peril as prerequisite for apotheosis has the effect of casting the new immortals as martyrs of a sort, who after their transformation are beyond the suffering that so affected their lives. The case of Romulus and Remus may even demonstrate the *necessity* of a martyr to the process of apotheosis. In Ovid's effort to whitewash Romulus, the poet takes great pains to distance Romulus from unpleasantness, including suffering on Romulus' part: Romulus does not suffer even in the process of apotheosis that others find so harrowing. Quirinus even appears to Proculus Julius to reassure the Romans that his apotheosis was successful, despite its lack of unpleasantness, and to dispel any rumors that he might have been murdered. Simultaneously, though, Ovid will not dash off an apotheosis as if it were painless and effortless--how could such an experience be transformative? The martyr's absence is felt, and for this reason, a surrogate is found. Remus accrues the suffering that Ovid did not attribute to Romulus. The twin brother, not the founder himself, is the one callously murdered, and he later reappears as a vengeful ghost complaining of his ignominious fate.

There is an instructive comparison to be made to the Romulus of the *Metamorphoses*, especially since Roman history in the *Metamorphoses* is covered so unevenly. Most people and events are wholly glossed over; Romulus is one of the few people who attracts any degree of attention, and even his role is not expounded in any

depth.¹⁵ In general, he is presented as a figure of interest, but not one for whom Ovid will serve as biographer. In the *Fasti* Romulus takes on an entirely different role; he is a figure of principal interest for several important episodes in the poem, and as such, his life story is detailed in an expansive, if not linear and systematic, way. Remus also receives much more attention in the *Fasti* than he did in the *Metamorphoses* (where he is never mentioned), but he generally figures as a foil to Romulus rather than a self-defined character. The differences between the representations of the twins in the different poems highlight the generic and programmatic differences between the two poems: Ovid has intrinsically different objectives in discussing Romulus in the *Fasti* than he does in the *Metamorphoses*, which accounts for the difference in the presentation of the apotheosis. In the cursory glance at Roman history that Ovid makes in the *Metamorphoses*, his attention is focused on the events that appeal to his central theme of metamorphosis, for which reason Romulus' apotheosis is described at more length than other episodes in his life. In the *Fasti*, on the contrary, the primary focus is Roman institutions and their origins, so Romulus is no longer a footnoted apotheosis before the more interesting Pythagoras, but rather an active force in founding Roman institutions.¹⁶

From here let us examine the role of the twins in the *Fasti*. There is no question that Romulus occupies the privileged place in Ovid's history. Ovid clearly represents Romulus to be a physically impressive and praiseworthy individual, and when the twins appear together, the author consistently makes clear that Remus suffers in comparison to

¹⁵ Romulus in the *Met.*: 14.772-828.

¹⁶ In contrast to the *Met.*, in which urban settings are eschewed in favor of pastoral ones (Hardie 1990), the *Fasti* displays its urban setting prominently, stressing the landmarks that identify the city from Romulus forward. Cf. Boyle (2003); additionally, Boyle and Woodard (2000) contains many maps that illustrate the geographical references in the *Fasti*. The greatness of Romulus (and Augustus) as founder is emphasized by the towering monuments and temples that his act of foundation gave rise to.

his brother.¹⁷ Further, in Ovid's account Romulus is essential and consistently beneficial to Rome, as reflected in the peculiarly one-sided description of his death/apotheosis. As these two brothers, one better and one worse, repeatedly appear alongside each other, the reader sees their fates intertwine and become dependent upon each other. The ultimate result is that each fate is carried to its logical conclusion--Romulus is apotheosed while Remus is murdered--but Remus' suffering serves as the violence embedded in Romulus' divine transformation.

The unfavorable comparison of Remus to Romulus is established from the very moment of their conception. After Rhea Silvia is impregnated by Mars (while she sleeps by the side of the Tiber), she awakes and relates the dream that came to her while she was, unbeknownst to herself, being raped:

*'utile sit faustumque, precor, quod imagine somni
vidimus: an somno clarius illud erat?
ignibus Iliacis aderam, cum lapsa capillis
decidit ante sacros lanea vitta focos.
inde duae pariter, visu mirabile, palmae
surgunt: ex illis altera maior erat,¹⁸
et gravibus ramis totum protexerat orbem,
contigeratque sua sidera summa coma.
ecce meus ferrum patruus molitur in illas:
terreor admonitu, corque timore micat.
Martia, picus, avis gemino pro stipite pugnant
et lupa: tuta per hos utraque palma fuit.'*

"I pray that what I saw in my dream might be beneficial and well-omened for me; or was that vision more clear than a dream? I stood before the Vestal flames, when my woolen fillet, having slipped from my hair, fell before the sacred hearth. From there--wonderful to see!--two palms rose up equally, **but of the two, one was greater**. This one covered the entire world with hefty branches, and it reached the highest stars with its tips. I saw my uncle attack the palms with a

¹⁷ The extraneous nature of Remus to Rome's foundation legend is discussed by Cornell (1975), who remarks that Remus "has no positive function in the story and is murdered before the actual foundation" (Cornell 27).

¹⁸ Cf. the authorial comment at 2.386, when Rhea Silvia undertakes to abandon the twins: *quid facis? ex istis Romulus alter erit*. In that case Romulus is the twin guaranteed an important future, whereas Remus is not even named.

blade, and I was frightened by this premonition, and my heart leapt with fear. The Martial bird, the woodpecker, and the wolf fight on behalf of those twin trees, and each palm was kept safe by these animals.”¹⁹

A prophetic dream as a precursor to the birth of a legendary man is an established trope, for example the dream of Astyages in Herodotus, in which he sees his daughter Mandane, the mother of Cyrus, give birth to a vine that overshadows all of Asia.²⁰ An unusual aspect of Rhea Silvia’s dream here is that she not only sees the future of her illustrious son, but also that of her less-noteworthy son, and makes a comparison between the two. Their fate, it seems, has been predetermined from their moment of conception, as they are marked out for a common triumph in which Romulus nevertheless will be more important. Shortly after their birth, Ovid again calls attention to Romulus’ superiority over Remus, apparently evident even when the boys are newborn: when the twins are being abandoned at the river, the lackeys abandoning them comment that *plus tamen ex illis iste vigoris habet*, “out of the two, this one has more energy.”²¹

The fact that Remus is consistently found lacking in comparison to his brother is thrown in sharp relief by the appearance of Remus in the Lemuria.²² In this passage, Remus has just been buried and mourned by his brother and adoptive parents. In the middle of the night, his family is startled to find his bloody ghost knocking on the door and demanding restitution.²³ Although the reader might expect the ghost-Remus to be a

¹⁹ *Fasti* 3.27-38.

²⁰ Hdt. 1.108. Krevans labels both Astyages’ and Rhea Silvia’s dreams “pregnancy-dreams” and classes them alongside the dreams at Sophocles *El.* 417-23 and Suetonius *Aug.* 94.4 (Krevans (1993) 266); I believe the dream of Vergil’s mother related at the beginning of Suetonius’ *Ver.* can also be usefully included in this category.

²¹ *Fasti* 2.396.

²² *Fasti* 5.445-80.

²³ As Darcos (2009) points out, ghost stories are infrequent occurrences in the works of Ovid, and there seems to be little consistency regarding the intentions and abilities of ghosts across the works of Ovid: ghost narratives “laissent libre cours à son goût de l’irrationnel” (Darcos 361). This makes the interpretation of Remus’ appearance more difficult. Stok (1991) 190 compares this episode to scenes from the *Aeneid*, including the ghostly appearances of Hector, Creusa, and the Penates. I address the literary

wan reflection of his living self, ghost-Remus has far more lines of dialogue than he ever did as a living character in the *Fasti*,²⁴ and his desires are much more strongly defined and forcefully stated than any of his desires are depicted elsewhere in the *Fasti*.

*umbra cruenta Remi visa est adsistere lecto,
atque haec exiguo murmure verba loqui:
'en ego dimidium vestri parsque altera voti,
cernite sim qualis, qui modo qualis eram!
qui modo, si volucres habuissem regna iubentes,
in populo potui maximus esse meo,
nunc sum elapsa rogi flammis et inanis imago:
haec est ex illo forma relictæ Remo.
heu ubi Mars pater est? si vos modo vera locuti,
uberaque expositis ille ferina dedit.
quem lupa servavit, manus hunc temeraria civis
perdidit. o quanto mitior illa fuit!
saeve Celer, crudelem animam per volnera reddas,
utque ego, sub terras sanguinolentus eas.
noluit hoc frater, pietas aequalis in illo est:
quod potuit, lacrimas in mea fata dedit.
hunc vos per lacrimas, per vestra alimenta rogate
ut celebrem nostro signet honore diem.'*

The bloody shade of Remus appeared to stand near the bed, and to speak these words in a barely-audible murmur: "Consider: I was the other half of you, and the matching part of your prayers; see what I am now, compared to what I was before! Now I who, if I had had the birds supporting my reign, could have been the greatest among my people, now I am a powerless shade, having slipped from the flames of the pyre: this is the only shape remaining of that Remus. Alas, where is my father Mars? If you spoke the truth, long ago, he presented the beast's teats to us exposed children. Now, after a wolf saved me, the reckless hand of a citizen slew me! Oh, the wolf was so much kinder! Savage Celer, may you die by violence, and may you go bloody down under the earth, as I did. My brother did not want this, for he has equitable loyalty, and he granted me what he was able, lamentation for my fate. But you, demand by my tears and by your nourishment that he mark this day as a festival in my honor."²⁵

It is a striking irony that the ghost-Remus accosts Romulus to *cernite sim qualis, qui modo qualis eram*, when the living character Remus pales compared to this forceful and

traditions pertaining to dream-visions of ghosts further in chapter one (regarding Anna Perenna and her dream-vision of Dido).

²⁴ Aside from the ghost's speech, Remus has only two lines in the *Fasti*: one at 2.374 (when he bests Romulus in the race to catch the cattle rustlers and declares his intentions to eat the sacrifice), and one at 4.842 (when he disparages the walls).

²⁵ *Fasti* 5.457-74.

commanding ghost, *exiguo murmure* notwithstanding. Although elsewhere in the *Fasti* we see Remus drive off a band of cattle rustlers, he has done little to challenge Romulus' authority to the extent that he does here by demanding a festival in his own honor. And although the ghost-Remus claims that, if the birds had not gone against him, he *could have been* the founder of the city, the reader may look askance at this bold claim, as if the living Remus could have held a candle to the living Romulus. It becomes clear that, during his lifetime, Remus was subsumed into Romulus and overrun by him, and that only in death has he come into his own as a character.

The appearance of a ghost is a common trope in classical literature, and should certainly be read in the context of the literary tradition. In Felton's taxonomy of Greek and Roman ghosts, Remus here would be classified as a "crisis apparition," one who appears only once, near the occasion of his death, bearing a critical message.²⁶ Most often ghosts in ancient literature appear for the sake of demanding burial rites--Remus' demand for an annual festival being a variation on this request--but in particular victims of murder often come to demand vengeance.²⁷ From the start, the appearance of a ghost in and of itself suggests that there is a reason why the deceased is not resting peacefully in his grave. The fearsome beginning of Remus' speech, his intense regret of his violent and untimely death, should lead the reader to expect a call for revenge. For that reason, Remus' speech carries a sense of abrupt deflation as his grave admonitions and violent

²⁶ Felton (1999) 29-34.

²⁷ Felton (1999) 8-11. See also Finucane (1984) 18-25, which also discusses the reasons why ghosts return in classical accounts, although Finucane's study of classical ghosts is rather cursory and indiscriminately conflates historical ghost stories with literary ones; he also makes no distinction between the various time periods within the classical era, and does nothing to address other cultural variables that might influence how ghosts are imagined. For a broad summary of appearances of ghosts within classical literature, see Bernstein (1993) 92-100; cf. Cumont (1923) 67-9 and chapter 5 ("Untimely Death"). Johnston (1999) chapter one ("Elpenor and Others: Narrative Descriptions of the Dead") provides a useful analysis of Greek folk beliefs about the afterlife, mostly as reflected in literature. Ogden (2002) chapter eight ("Ghosts") has a useful compilation of descriptions of ghosts in ancient literature, but little overall analysis of the subject.

curses give way to an admission that Romulus is not to blame and a polite request for commemoration. Remus mourns his fate, and complains that he was killed by a *citizen's* hand, sustaining some ambiguity about which citizen he considers at fault for his death. Nevertheless, in the end he abruptly checks himself and specifies that his complaint is against Celer, the deputy of Romulus who appears in no accounts prior to Ovid,²⁸ as if suddenly remembering that Romulus is supposed to be exonerated from fault. The apostrophe to Celer highlights the fact that it would make much more sense if he were actually addressing his grievance to Celer, and not someone who is ostensibly blameless for his death. This episode strongly suggests that its primary purpose is not the founding of the memorial festival, but rather it is an opportunity for Remus to exculpate Romulus explicitly.²⁹

In the end, Remus' speech ostensibly declares Romulus innocent, even though the festival instituted on Remus' behalf implies a wrong done to him by Romulus, and the speech carries an ominous undertone of transgression and accusation and obligation beneath his professed exculpation. The supportive reader is free to take this forgiveness at face value, even as the suspicious reader may cynically dismiss it as a transparent effort by Ovid to win the emperor's favor through flattery (remembering Augustus' self-identification with Romulus as a new founder of Rome). Given Ovid's frequent reference

²⁸ Livy nevertheless mentions (1.15.8) a group of men called *Celeres* who served as Romulus' bodyguard, but they are not mentioned until well after Remus' death.

²⁹ Wagenvoort (1956) 177 notes the "conciliatory tendency" of Ovid's narrative. In negotiating the inconsistent depiction of Romulus in the *Fasti* and the extent of his culpability in Remus' death, the reader cannot neglect the synchrisis between Augustus and Romulus at *Fasti* 2.133-44, in which Romulus, over the course of a number of comparisons, is depicted as thoroughly inferior to Augustus. At 2.143 Augustus' practice of *clementia* is juxtaposed against *Romule...te Remus incusat*, which heavily implies that Romulus is in fact to blame for Remus' death. (Indeed, Romulus' implied responsibility for Remus' death compares quite unfavorably to not just Augustus' *clementia*, but also Remus' ostentatious forgiveness of Romulus.) This well illustrates the idea that in the *Fasti* Romulus is generally held up as a model of responsible leadership, but when compared to Augustus directly he is consistently found wanting. Cf. Stok (1991).

to himself throughout the exilic works as a ghost,³⁰ it is interesting to read this sepulchral intrusion of Remus as an avatar for Ovid himself, on a personal mission to improve his own position by improving Romulus' reputation. This spin to the founder's advantage shows a strong impulse on Ovid's part to protect Romulus' reputation and prevent any negative associations with him. Ovid, it is no secret, was eager to win the approval of the ruling regime, and the importance of Romulus within Augustan ideology necessitated that he too should be praised, even if Ovid in assembling what I have called an incoherent portrait of Romulus did not consistently maintain a faultless image of the founder.

The violence of Remus' death is glaring and inescapable. Naturally his bloody appearance indicates the fact that his was a particularly unpleasant death, one that occurred well before his time, with great suffering, and at the hands of an enemy.³¹ We have, in fact, witnessed his death earlier in the *Fasti*, so we can go back and examine what skulduggery precipitated his gruesome apparition.

*'nil opus est,' dixit 'certamine' Romulus 'ullo;
magna fides avium est: experiamur aves.'
res placet: alter init nemorosi saxa Palati;
alter Aventinum mane cacumen init.
sex Remus, hic volucres bis sex videt ordine; pacto
statur, et arbitrium Romulus urbis habet...
hoc Celer urget opus, quem Romulus ipse vocarat,
'sint' que, 'Celer, curae' dixerat 'ista tuae,
neve quis aut muros aut factam vomere fossam
transeat; audentem talia dede neci.'
quod Remus ignorans humiles contemnere muros
coepit, et 'his populus' dicere 'tutus erit?'
nec mora, transiluit: rutro Celer occupat ausum;
ille premit duram sanguinolentus humum.*

"There is no need for any contention;" Romulus said, "the birds are very reliable, so let us ask the birds." It was agreed upon. The one went up on the cliffs of the wooded Palatine; the other went

³⁰ Cf. Dufallo 125-6.

³¹ Felton (1999) 17-8, Darcos (2009) 358-60.

up on the Aventine peak in the morning. Remus saw six birds, but Romulus saw twelve in a row, and they carried it out as agreed upon, so Romulus was granted authority over the city...[When Romulus was setting the pomerium] Celer was encouraging Romulus in this work, whom Romulus himself had directed: "Celer, this is your job: let no one go across either my walls or the trench made by my plow; whoever attempts this, kill them." But Remus, unaware of this, began to scoff at the pitiful walls, and said, "The citizens will be kept safe by these?" And right away, he jumped over them, and Celer struck him with a spade for daring to do so. He hit the ground already bloody.³²

For all its violence, the *Fasti* is not a particularly bloody work, and there are few episodes in the *Fasti* that illustrate blood or gore. Even Julius Caesar's murder, even in the assault on Anna Perenna, even Ino's long sequence of trials, do not describe the graphic details of the attacks, just as we will see in chapter three that the prurient details are generally omitted from rape narratives as well. For this reason, Remus' murder stands out as particularly violent, violence that attracts attention to itself within a text that otherwise tends to look away from blood. It is noteworthy that Remus' murder retains this markedly violent aspect even as, or perhaps because, its attribution to Romulus is assiduously denied.

Here we should consider the question of Ovid's "Callimachean" tendency (as discussed in the preceding chapter) to provide multiple, conflicting, origin narratives for rituals and celebrations. In scholarly literature, this practice is conventionally discussed as an aspect of Ovid's erudite style,³³ to illustrate that he has researched the question enough to find multiple explanations, but that he still maintains enough scholarly detachment that he declines to take sides between them. In most cases, this may be a plausible explanation, but it is striking that this practice is decisively reversed in his account of Romulus' biography, particularly in Remus' death. Romulus is a prominent historical figure, and his accomplishments are enthusiastically recounted by many

³² *Fasti* 4.813-8, 837-44.

³³ Fantham (1998) 289, on the origin of the Parilia; Harries (1989) 184.

authors, including Livy, whose work was a major source for the *Fasti*. Livy makes a practice of providing alternative accounts of events where available, and, were Ovid a faithful Callimachean, he would no doubt preserve these alternative stories presented by Livy. On the contrary, Ovid conscientiously revises most stories about Romulus that reflect poorly on the founder.³⁴ Likewise, when Romulus and Remus take the auspices to settle the question of who the founder and ruler of the city will be, Livy's disagreement over the birds is neatly omitted.³⁵

Priori Remo augurium uenisse fertur, sex uoltores; iamque nuntiato augurio cum duplex numerus Romulo se ostendisset, utrumque regem sua multitudo consalutauerat: tempore illi praecepto, at hi numero auium regnum trahebant. Inde cum altercatione congressi certamine irarum ad caedem uertuntur; ibi in turba ictus Remus cecidit. Volgatior fama est ludibrio fratris Remum nouos transiluisse muros; inde ab irato Romulo, cum uerbis quoque increpitans adiecisset, 'Sic deinde, quicumque alius transiliet moenia mea', interfectum. Ita solus potitus imperio Romulus; condita urbs conditoris nomine appellata.

Although the augurial sign of six vultures is said to have arrived for Remus first, after he had announced this result, double that number revealed itself to Romulus, and a crowd recognized each as king, since the one group was awarding the kingdom based on priority, but the other based on the number of birds. At that point, when they had gathered in a dispute, the argument turned to bloodshed, for Remus was struck and died among the crowd. The more popular version is that Remus jumped over his brother's new walls as a joke, for which reason he was killed by an irate Romulus, who added the words, "May anyone who jumps over my walls likewise die." Thus Romulus alone gained the *imperium*, and the city when founded was given the name of the founder.³⁶

³⁴ Ovid's tendency to reframe events in Romulus' favor is alluded to by Barchiesi (1997) 156 who claims (in reference to an Ovidian allusion to a remark on Romulus in the *Georgics*) that "Virgil does not shrink from the task of handling the dark side of Rome's origins, the violence that is already inscribed in the city's foundation." On the contrary, Ovid's Romulus is generally not allowed to be an ambiguous character, and his depiction has been conscientiously polished from depictions of Romulus in other authors.

³⁵ Likewise, while Livy suggests (1.4.2) that Romulus' father may have been an ordinary mortal rather than a god, this scurrilous suggestion is entirely omitted by Ovid, which serves to further bolster his respectability and deflect criticism.

³⁶ Livy 1.7.1-3.

In revising Livy's version, Ovid eliminates the quarrel between the twins, along with Romulus' direct agency in the murder, thus emphasizing the harmony between the twins and aiding their conflation into a single founder-figure.³⁷

Although Ovid's Romulus echoes Livy's gnomic statement over Remus' corpse ('*sic*' que '*meos muros transeat hostis*' ait³⁸) and maintains a dignified stoicism in the face of his brother's death, Ovid establishes the fact that Romulus feels regret that his brother should suffer death at his order, even if the murder is displaced onto the hands of an obscure "Celer:"

*haec ubi rex didicit, lacrimas introrsus obortas
devorat et clausum pectore vulnus habet.
flere palam non volt exemplaue fortia servat,
'sic' que 'meos muros transeat hostis' ait.
dat tamen exsequias; nec iam suspendere fletum
sustinet, et pietas dissimulata patet;
osculaue adplicuit posito suprema feretro
atque ait 'invito frater adempte, vale.'*

When the king learned these things, he inwardly concealed his rising sobs and kept his wound closed up in his chest. He did not want to weep openly; he wanted to provide an example of strength, and so he said, "Let enemies also cross my wall that way." He provided funerary honors, and he was no longer able to hold back his tears, and his concealed affection became visible. He gave the final kisses to the bier, and he said, "Farewell, brother, taken from me unwilling."³⁹

³⁷ Pontone (1986) explores the use of the fratricide legend across Roman historical literature. His work approaches the legend of Romulus' fratricide as an essential element of the Roman historical narrative, as evidenced by its consistent appearance in historical works; Roman historians are obligated to address this episode as part of the course of history and provide perhaps a condemnation or a justification. In approaching Ovid's work, it is noteworthy per se that Ovid does not feel obligated to likewise address the story as a fratricide; Ovid plays loose with tradition and pins the murder on someone other than the founder. His denial and revisionism, especially considering his refusal to even nod to the well-known fratricide story, set Ovid clearly apart from historians and their obligations to historicity. Ovid's revisionist decisions in the fratricide story also highlight the fact that Ovid detects the need for revision in the fratricide story, that is, Ovid senses that it is disadvantageous in some way and Ovid is correcting it. The most efficient conclusion is that the story reflects poorly on Romulus and Ovid is revising it to improve Romulus' reputation. Wagenvoort (1956) also discusses the prevalence of the legend of Romulus' fratricide and the motives behind its propagation or suppression, but Wagenvoort pays scant attention to Ovid's works, and makes no mention of such influential sources on Ovid's *Fasti* as Ennius' *Annales* or Livy.

³⁸ *Fasti* 4.848.

³⁹ *Fasti* 4.845-52.

By showing Romulus' grief and remorse at his brother's death, Ovid ameliorates actions that in Livy's account might be seen as blameworthy.

Here again we run up against the question of internal narrators and their reliability. The narrator, in this case, is Quirinus, "scarcely a disinterested party," as Newlands points out.⁴⁰ Romulus was already described as guilty by Ovid in a litany of unfavorable comparisons at the syncretism of Augustus and Romulus, which suggests that, in this case, Quirinus is intentionally deflecting blame from himself and writing in his own favor a counternarrative against the prevailing opinion.⁴¹ In fact, Barchiesi contends that, even after the transposition of Remus' murder onto Celer's hands, an air of culpability nevertheless clings to Romulus.⁴² Regardless of the identity of the victim of Celer's attack, the reader may well ask whether Romulus' instructions indicate an intention to instigate violence. A more clement ruler after all might have instructed Celer to *prevent* rather than *punish* any crossing of the wall. The fact that Romulus' instructions attempt to create rather than defuse violence suggests that Romulus is eager to set an example to discourage transgressions, and only random chance decreed that his brother, and not someone less dear to him, should fall victim to his bloodthirstiness. The reader can find a certain pathos in Romulus' regret that his short-sighted display of bellicosity had such immediate and personal consequences for him, as well as a moral that a competent leader should restrain indiscriminate violence until it has been fully considered and justly dispensed.

⁴⁰ Newlands (1995) 69.

⁴¹ Bearing in mind that Quirinus is the narrator at this point, Murgatroyd (2005) 45n argues that Romulus should be understood as making an effort to set the record straight and clear his name.

⁴² Barchiesi (1997) 160-1.

This cognitive dissonance of this whitewashing becomes even more apparent when read in conjunction with the syncrisis at 2.133-44, in which Romulus is compared unfavorably to Augustus:

*Romule, concedes: facit hic tua magna tuendo
moenia, tu dederas transilienda Remo.
te Tatius parvique Cures Caeninaque sensit,
hoc duce Romanum est solis utrumque latus;
tu breve nescioquid victae telluris habebas,
quodcumque est alto sub Iove, Caesar habet.
tu rapis, hic castas duce se iubet esse maritas;⁴³
tu recipis luco, reppulit ille nefas;
vis tibi grata fuit, florent sub Caesare leges;
tu domini nomen, principis ille tenet;
te Remus incusat, veniam dedit hostibus ille;
caelestem fecit te pater, ille patrem.*

Romulus, you must give way: for the sake of protection, this man [Augustus] builds up your walls into great things, while you provided walls that could be jumped over by Remus. Tatius and the Cures and Caenina judged you to be of little worth, but now that this man is in command, even the far side of the sun is Roman. You possessed a tiny scrap of conquered land, but Augustus possesses everything beneath the broad sky. You abduct wives, while he, with himself in the lead, orders wives to be chaste matrons. You accept *nefas* into your grove, while he casts it out. Violence is pleasing to you, but in the reign of Caesar laws reign supreme. You have the title “master,” while he has the title “first citizen.” Remus accuses you, but he forgave his enemies. And while your father made you a god, he made his father a god.

Among this litany of reprimands to the founder, the one that stands out is “Remus accuses you,” implying that Remus is justified in holding a grievance against Romulus. While “Celer” may have been assigned the blame in the narration of the story, Ovid

⁴³ It is possible to see in this line a reference to Augustus’ own marriage to Livia, and the accusation (preserved in Tacitus and Suetonius) that Augustus tyrannically stole Livia away from her first husband (see Flory (1988)). Although the text focuses on the marriages that the leaders *arranged* rather than *participated in*, there is an implied contrast between Romulus’ own marriage, the product of premeditated violence, and Augustus’, which in this comparison ought to be an exemplar of uprightness. The author’s awkward sidestepping of this comparison suggests that there was no effective comparison to make because Augustus’ marriage was just as tyrannically violent as Romulus’. The comparison is even more pointed when one recalls that, according to some sources, Hersilie was the only one of the abducted Sabine Women who was already married to another man (Wiseman (1983)). All the same, one must account for other lines from the exilic poetry in which Ovid claims that Livia and Augustus each only married once, so his reliability as Livia’s biographer may be questionable.

proves his own whitewashing ineffective *even within his own narrative* as he allows the suggestion of fault to cling inescapably to Romulus.

In light of all this material, it is strange that the first episode narrated in the *Fasti* about Romulus and Remus is their appearance at Lupercalia. Not only is this a reasonably obscure episode in the lives of the Roman founders⁴⁴ (compared to, for example, their conception and adoption, the establishment of the Asylum, the rape of the Sabines, or the fratricide), but it is also an episode in which Romulus does not come off as superior to Remus, nor even particularly clement.⁴⁵ Here a sacrifice is interrupted and Romulus and Remus separate, each with his own followers, in pursuit of a band of cattle rustlers. It is Remus and his band who are successful in capturing the brigands, and consequently they return to the sacrifice first and devour the sacrifice before Romulus and his followers can get a bite. Remus even declares, surveying the feast while Romulus has not yet returned, *haec certe non nisi victor edet*,⁴⁶ “certainly no one except the victor will eat this feast.” When Romulus returns, he expresses his disappointment that he failed to capture the robbers and also missed the feast.

*ut rediit, veribus stridentia detrahit exta
atque ait 'haec certe non nisi victor edet.'
dicta facit, Fabiique simul. venit inritus illuc
Romulus et mensas ossaque nuda videt.
risit, et indoluit Fabios potuisse Remumque
vincere, Quintilios non potuisse suos.*

When [Remus] returned, he seized the sputtering meat off the spits, and declared, “Certainly no one except the victor will eat these.” He made good on his word, and so did the Fabii [his followers]. Then unsuccessful Romulus arrived and saw the tables and the bare bones. He laughed,

⁴⁴ A similar, but separate, Lupercalia-related episode is related at Livy 1.5.

⁴⁵ Stok (1991) introduces this episode by saying (200) “La scena...non appare di agevole interpretazione,” but concludes (Stok 203) that “Quella fra i due fratelli è intesa da Ovidio come una competizione, dalla quale esce vincitore Remo.” Murgatroyd (2005) 54 notes the unusually strong personality Remus displays in this episode.

⁴⁶ *Fasti* 2.374.

and he was disappointed that Remus and the Fabii were able to prevail, rather than his own Quintilii.⁴⁷

As far as Romulus' personal glory is concerned, this is an instance of insult upon injury, since he has his failure as a warrior driven home by his empty stomach. Even more, Barchiesi contends that, although Romulus tries to laugh off his wounded pride, the *indoluit* betrays a sinister attitude of Romulus toward his brother, foreshadowing the fratricide (or, in this work, the quasi-fratricide) that will appear in book 4.⁴⁸ In short, this particular episode does not in any way portray Romulus as either unassailably admirable, quintessentially Roman, or improbably glorified in the way characteristic of other episodes. Given that this is the reader's first introduction to the twins, and one that by all rights ought to set the tone for the other episodes, it is puzzling that the depiction of the twins is so at odds with the depiction that will develop in later episodes. I will not pretend that this episode is easily assimilated into a consistent reading of Romulus throughout the *Fasti*, but the foreshadowing of future violence shows that, however much Romulus and Remus are bound up in each other's fates, they must ultimately diverge so that Romulus will seek immortality, and Remus will consequently become a casualty of his brother's foundation program.

After the death of Remus, Romulus continues on alone, perpetrating violence as necessary until his transformation. A curious aspect of Romulus' characterization is the particular circumstances of his death/apotheosis. In the accounts of Cicero and Livy, Romulus' end is given as a set of alternatives: either he was taken up to Olympus in a

⁴⁷ *Fasti* 2.373-8.

⁴⁸ Barchiesi (1997) 159.

whirlwind, or he was suddenly killed by the senators.⁴⁹ Livy's version is clearly a model for Ovid's:

His mortalibus editis operibus cum ad exercitum recensendum contionem in campo ad Caprae paludem haberet, subito coorta tempestas cum magno fragore tonitribusque tam denso regem operuit nimbo ut conspectum eius contioni abstulerit; nec deinde in terris Romulus fuit...Deinde a paucis initio facto, deum deo natum, regem parentemque urbis Romanae saluere uniuersi Romulum iubent; pacem precibus exposcunt, uti uolens propitius suam semper sospitet progeniem. Fuisse credo tum quoque aliquos qui discerptum regem patrum manibus taciti arguerent; manauit enim haec quoque sed perobscura fama; illam alteram admiratio uiri et pauor praesens nobilitauit. Et consilio etiam unius hominis addita rei dicitur fides. Namque Proculus Iulius, sollicita ciuitate desiderio regis et infensa patribus, grauis, ut traditur, quamuis magnae rei auctor, in contionem prodit.

After [Romulus] had accomplished these earthly works, he was holding an assembly in the Campus Martius near the Goat's Swamp for the sake of reviewing the army, when suddenly a storm rose up with tremendous upheaval and thunder and concealed the king in such a dense cloud that the assembly was unable to see him, and Romulus was no longer on earth...Then, at the initiative of a few, all the people decided to hail Romulus as a god born from a god, the king and the father of Rome. They prayed for peace, that he might always willingly and favorably protect his children. At that time there were also, I believe, some who quietly claimed that the king had been dismembered by the hands of the Senators, for this very obscure story has also persisted, but the former was preferred due to admiration for the man and immediate fear. And credibility is said to have been lent to the matter by the testimony of one man, for Proculus Iulius appeared before the assembly when the citizenry was distraught with grief over their king and unfriendly to the Senate, a respectable man, it is said, however weighty the subject he took up.⁵⁰

By contrast to *Ab Urbe Condita*, in the *Fasti*, Romulus is conclusively presented as stolen away by divine intervention, with the question of dishonorable murder resoundingly dismissed.

⁴⁹ For a detailed comparison between Romulus' apotheosis narratives in Ovid and those in prose authors, see Gosling (2002). Note that Ennius' depiction of Romulus' apotheosis is scantily preserved, but there is a general scholarly agreement that Ennius probably approached this event euhemeristically; cf. Skutsch (1985) 260, Feeney (1991) 122-3. Coarelli (1986) 188-94 suggests that each of the two narratives of Romulus' death/apotheosis serves as the *aition* for one of the two meeting places of Roman assemblies (in the Forum and the Campus Martius). Furthermore, he sees the site of the destruction of the king as symbolic of the destruction of the monarchy and therefore fitting as a meeting place to elect officials in the wake of the monarchy. Ovid's setting of the action in a specific, well known location, recalls Rea's (2007) 4-5 idea of "archaic-Augustan Rome" and the notion that "Rome had endured and even flourished, in spite of the strife that had tainted its foundations."

⁵⁰ Livy 1.16.1, 3-5.

*est locus, antiqui Caprae dixere paludem:
forte tuis illic, Romule, iura dabas.
sol fugit, et removent subeuntia nubila caelum,
et gravis effusis decidit imber aquis.
hinc tonat, hinc missis abrumpitur ignibus aether:
fit fuga, rex patriis astra petebat equis.*

There is a place; the ancients called it the Goat's Swamp: Romulus, you happened to be doing judicial service there for your people. The sun flees, and the encroaching clouds swallow the sky, and an intense rain pelts down in gushing streams. Here it thunders, here the air is split by lightning sent down, and a departure takes place: the king was seeking the stars with his father's horses.⁵¹

The story about the senators is presented as a false rumor that might have gained ground, had Proculus Iulius not appeared with confirmation of the apotheosis.

*rex patriis astra petebat equis.
luctus erat, falsaeque patres in crimine caedis,
haesissetque animis forsitan illa fides;
sed Proculus Longa veniebat Iulius Alba...
pulcher et humano maior trabeaque decorus
Romulus in media visus adesse via
et dixisse simul 'prohibe lugere Quirites,
nec violent lacrimis numina nostra suis:
tura ferant placentque novum pia turba Quirinum,
et patrias artes militiamque colant.'
iussit et in tenues oculis evanuit auras;
convocat hic populos iussaue verba refert.
templa deo fiunt: collis quoque dictus ab illo est,
et referunt certi sacra paterna dies.*

The king [Romulus] ascended to the stars on his father's horses. There was mourning, **and the Senators were charged spuriously with murder, and perhaps belief would have lodged in people's minds**, but Proculus Julius was traveling from Alba Longa...Romulus appeared to stand in the middle of the road, magnificent, larger than life, and stately in his *trabea*, and at the same time he said, 'Forbid the Romans to mourn, nor should they damage my divinity with their tears: the dutiful Romans should present incense and sacrifice to the new god Quirinus, and they should develop their military and their ancestral arts.' He gave these orders and, before Proculus' eyes, faded into thin air; Proculus assembled the people and reported the god's commands. They built temples to the god, and a hill received its name from him, and set days perpetuate the ancestral rites.⁵²

⁵¹ *Fasti* 2.491-6.

⁵² *Fasti* 2.496-9, 503-512.

As Gosling notes,⁵³ Proculus Iulius' story has been substantially embellished from its source material in Livy, so Ovid is obviously calling attention to it as a significant event.⁵⁴ At this point the idea of bowdlerizing arises again, since Ovid again is adapting material from Livy and conspicuously omitting alternative versions that are unfavorable to the founder. The omission of Romulus' murder is a striking innovation on Ovid's part, considering that the murder is regularly presented as an equally valid possibility in pre-Ovidian narratives.⁵⁵ In fact, Gosling goes so far as to suggest that death was the only possibility taken seriously by Roman historians--no historians present Romulus' apotheosis as reality.⁵⁶ She further states that "Typically, Ovid shows no interest in the political background which mainly interests Cicero and Dionysius, and is concerned with those aspects of the story which a more sober historical approach finds least plausible,"⁵⁷ casting further doubt on Ovid as a vehicle for truth in general.⁵⁸ In choosing to favor the fantastic version of Romulus' fate and omit the rationalized one, Ovid implicitly indicates

⁵³ Gosling (2002) 58-9.

⁵⁴ Of all the episodes from Romulus' life in the *Fasti*, his death/apotheosis is the event that most strongly evokes its parallel in the *Met.* Both events open with the same apostrophe to Romulus (*Romule, iura dabas*), and in both cases Mars (quoting Ennius) invokes Jupiter's promise to apotheose his son. Gosling (2002) 55 stresses the scant differences between these episodes, most notably the analogy in the *Met.* of Romulus' body to a sling bullet and the appending of Julius Proculus.

⁵⁵ Myers (2009) 201: "All sources agree that there is no accepted tradition about [Romulus'] fate." Robinson (2003) 612-3 also notes that Ovid's account of Romulus' deification is unusually flattering to the ruling party (in Robinson's words, Ovid is "extremely well-behaved" and "on-message"), although Robinson argues that this veneer of orthodoxy is ultimately undermined by the juxtaposition of the Quirinalia with the Fornacalia.

⁵⁶ Gosling (2002) 57-8. Cf. McGowan (2009) 31-2, who argues that Ovid did not construe his poetry as history, contra Hardie (2002) who argues that "One effect *within* the *Metamorphoses* is to further erode any possibility of drawing a sharp distinction between the worlds of *fabula* and *historia*" (Hardie 198).

⁵⁷ Gosling (2002) 57. At the same time, Gosling calls attention to Scipio's vision of Romulus' world as depicted in Cicero's *Rep.*, where Cicero's Scipio describes the age of Romulus as "one of culture and erudition, not of primitive superstition, making the acceptance of [Romulus'] deification the more impressive" (Gosling 2002:63). Even if Cicero did not take Romulus' deification seriously, Cicero's Scipio did.

⁵⁸ One can also compare the double tradition of Aeneas' fate (to wit, that he was either apotheosed or was killed in battle at the Numicus; see Frazer *ad Fasti* 3.647) that is likewise denied to Aeneas by Ovid, clearly in the *Metamorphoses*, and implicitly in the *Fasti*.

that Romulus is being treated as a mythic figure rather than one of prosaic historical fact, and in doing so reveals his ideas of what it means to be divine.

Here we come to the fate of Romulus, the status he gains through the foundation of Rome, and his ultimate ascent to divinity. Romulus' apotheosis in the *Fasti* is important because it stands in the shadow of the Hercules Model, and yet Ovid strenuously denies any connection between the Hercules Model and Romulus. The brief allusion to Romulus' murder suggests that, like Julius Caesar, Romulus might have been apotheosed to avert a violent death. Nevertheless, this hint of murder is immediately dismissed by Julius Proculus' vision of Quirinus, which forces the conclusion that Romulus was never in danger of violently losing his life, and that no deity would have had to intervene to prevent him from being murdered because, Ovid stresses, Romulus was not murdered. The pressure that Ovid exerts fighting this model suggests, first of all, that the model is sufficiently standard that his readers would assume it applied to Romulus if he did not clearly deny it. Moreover, though, it sets Romulus apart from, and possibly above, all of the other apotheosed heroes in the *Fasti*, who are forced to suffer violence as an unavoidable consequence of apotheosis.

Here again we encounter the idea of the twins as a single person conflated into one. Drossart presents the twins as illustrating complementary fates: the narratives of Remus' death and reappearance as a ghost parallel the narratives of Romulus' apotheosis and his epiphany to Proculus Julius.⁵⁹ As complementary figures, while they are both alive, Remus' identity pales in comparison to Romulus', although Remus speaks of the twins as sharing the same father, the same upbringing. Only in the afterlife do their fates clearly diverge and Remus takes on an identity of his own. In the course of his life,

⁵⁹ Drossart (1972).

Romulus founds Rome and takes authority as ruler, but this action has divergent consequences: Remus is murdered, while Romulus gains immortality.

Romulus is useful as a point of comparison in discussing the intersection of violence and apotheosis in the *Fasti*. His is an apotheosis that is not at all violent, once the excision of the alternative account of his death is performed. The violence of the senators is alluded to, but is dismissed as a mere rumor, while Quirinus appears for the sake of explaining the true story. It is useful to remember that Quirinus is in some ways a doublet for Mars, which is to say a war god (as evidenced by his final injunction to Proculus Iulius⁶⁰ that the Romans cultivate their “ancestral arts”--presumably statecraft, as Anchises instructs in the *Aeneid*--and their military), and that Romulus is noteworthy as a warrior king, who led hostilities against (most famously) Titus Tatius, among many others. Yet his many wars are for the most part omitted from the *Fasti*, and even the wars that are included in this poem dramatically downplay Romulus’ role in them.⁶¹ When the war with Titus Tatius is mentioned, the reader hears descriptions of Tarpeia’s betrayal or Juno’s intervention at the gate and Janus’ thwarting of her. Romulus is nowhere to be found. So as the violence has been discreetly removed from his apotheosis, so the violence is omitted from his character and history.

In my dissertation I have sketched a systematic relationship between violence and supernatural transformation in the *Fasti*, to the effect of “violence necessarily causes supernatural transformation, and supernatural transformation is necessarily precipitated by violence.” This correlation is not precisely reliable, and Romulus is the most

⁶⁰ *Fasti* 2.508: *patrias artes militiamque colant*.

⁶¹ Gosling (2002) discusses this point in more detail, including the force of the *trabeatus Romulus* who appears in the *Fasti* and the allusion that Quirinus makes to Anchises’ famous advice to future Romans. Tissol (2002) 330 discusses the omission of wartime accomplishments as an anti-euhemeristic device, denying the reader a rationale for Romulus’ deification.

prominent exception: he emphatically does not suffer violence in the process of apotheosis. We appear to have an unmatched half of the given model. The catalyzing violence is nevertheless preserved, however, in the murder of Remus, a prominently anomalous example in the *Fasti* of a victim of violence who is not transformed by the experience. In this way the twinned fates of Romulus and Remus are fitted together: the apotheosis of Romulus is precipitated by violence suffered by his brother, not by Romulus himself. Ovid's Romulus and Remus share one fate, although they do so in the sense that Romulus reaps the benefit from the violence suffered by Remus. This element of dividing one fate, one transformation, between Romulus and Remus seems to be original to Ovid, since in previous accounts the reader sees Romulus suffer violence at the hands of the senators, in which case his narrative arc of violence/transformation is complete in itself and does not require Remus' death to fill it out.

The conflation of the two brothers is driven home by Mars' entreaty of Jupiter to apotheose Romulus. When the time for Romulus' apotheosis has arrived, Mars speaks on his behalf to Jupiter and urges Jupiter to fulfill his promise that Romulus should be apotheosed. But in doing so, he makes reference to both of his sons together, and openly states that the one son must take the place of two.

*“redde patri natum: quamvis intercidit alter,
 pro se proque Remo qui mihi restat erit.
 ‘unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli’⁶²*

⁶² This line, as has been generally recognized, is a quotation from Ennius, in which it also referred to the deification of Romulus (*Annales* 1.54 (Skutsch), cf. Skutsch (1985) 205, Robinson (2011) s.v. 2.487, Myers (2009) s.v. 14.812-5). It curiously recalls a moment in the pseudo-Ovidian *Consolatio ad Liviam*. There the death of Drusus causes the Tiber to flood in grief, and Mars reminds Tiber that “only three” Romans are destined for apotheosis: Romulus, Caesar, and Augustus (*Consolatio* 243-6). Since the *Consolatio* ends without Drusus being apotheosed, the similarity seems to be restricted to the close accounting of apotheosed Romans, but the brotherhood connection is suggestive, insofar as Drusus, like Romulus, was very closely associated with his brother in his public personality, and went so far as to co-sponsor with Tiberius the temple of the Dioscuri.

tu mihi dixisti: sint rata dicta Iovis."

"Return the son to his father: although the one died, **the one who remains for me will serve on behalf of himself and on behalf of Remus.** You said to me, 'There will be one whom you will lift into the blue of the sky,' so let those words be ratified."⁶³

In this statement, the reader sees that Remus has been superseded by Romulus, and indeed subsumed into him. The two brothers both carry importance in the world, but Romulus has to undertake the roles and responsibilities of both of them, Remus having lost that ability.

Even though Ovid obviously has complicated motivations in choosing how to represent Romulus, he adheres to the general scheme of apotheosis in the *Fasti*, to wit, one must suffer violence before reaching immortality. In Romulus' case, however, the founder's fate is so inextricably bound up in that of his twin that, while Romulus himself escapes a violent attack, a violent death nevertheless falls upon Remus. This violence built into the process of apotheosis has the effect of casting those apotheosed as martyrs whose suffering is rewarded with power, prestige, and immortality. Moreover, it grants special place to violence as a vehicle to transformation and confirms the force of violence as a mystical power. Violence is inextricably part of Romulus' story as it is part of Roman history, and even Ovid in refashioning Roman legend cannot omit violence as a transformative catalyst. Romulus, for his part, generally escapes suffering pain in the *Fasti*, and, for the most part, in the instances in which he might have caused pain to others, he is either exonerated by the narrator (in the case of Remus' murder), or the pain is softened to the point of being negligible. This is what happens in the rape of Rhea Silvia.

⁶³ *Fasti* 2.485-8.

Rhea Silvia

Rhea Silvia is a character best known in Roman legend for her rape by Mars, and the *Fasti* is no exception. She is also yet another of Ovid's characters who is subject to violence--and the possibility of transformation is hinted at, although not fully elucidated--and as such it is instructive to compare Ovid's treatment of Rhea Silvia with that of his predecessors to illustrate how Ovid's scrubbing-off of blood from the hands of Romulus even extends to the founder's own conception. We should begin with Ovid's most influential source, Livy, in which Rhea Silvia is raped in the ordinary, unspecified but presumably violent way:

Vi compressa Vestalis cum geminum partum edidisset, seu ita rata seu quia deus auctor culpae honestior erat, Martem incertae stirpis patrem nuncupat. Sed nec di nec homines aut ipsam aut stirpem a crudelitate regia uindicant: sacerdos uincta in custodiam datur.

The Vestal was raped, and when she gave birth to twins, she alleged--whether she truly believed this, or whether she thought it more dignified to have a god as the author of the crime--that Mars was the father of her bastard children. But neither gods nor men spared either her or her children from the king's cruelty: the priestess was imprisoned and put in chains.⁶⁴

Here the violence against Rhea Silvia is evident in the language: she is *ui compressa*, and later is subject to *crudelitas*. In contrast, Ovid's Mars manages to rape Rhea Silvia so gently that she does not even wake from her nap, when she has fallen asleep fortuitously on the banks of the Tiber. Mars softens his touch enough that she remains asleep throughout her impregnation.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ Livy 1.4.2-3.

⁶⁵ Compare this to the rapes in the *Met.*, in which very few rape victims manage to sleep through their rapes. The rapes of Callisto and Philomela are quoted in this dissertation in chapters four and three respectively. Chione (*Met.* 11.301-17) is specified to sleep through the attack, for the specific reason that Mercury made her fall asleep with his Lethaeian wand at an unusual time in the middle of the day, specifically so he could rape her before Apollo (who was waiting patiently until nightfall) got the chance.

*tum quoque inermis eras, cum te Romana sacerdos
 cepit, ut huic urbi semina magna dares.
 Silvia Vestalis (quid enim vetat inde moveri?)
 sacra lavaturas mane petebat aquas.
 ventum erat ad molli declivem tramite ripam;
 ponitur e summa fictilis urna coma:
 fessa resedit humo, ventosque accepit aperto
 pectore, turbatas restituitque comas.
 dum sedet, umbrosae salices volucresque canorae
 fecerunt somnos et leve murmur aquae;
 blanda quies furtim victis obrepsit ocellis,
 et cadit a mento languida facta manus.
 Mars videt hanc visamque cupit potiturque cupita,
 et sua divina furta fefellit ope.
 somnus abit, iacet ipsa gravis; iam scilicet intra
 viscera Romanae conditor urbis erat.
 languida consurgit, nec scit cur languida surgat.*

[Mars,] you were also unarmed when the Roman priestess received you, so that you would provide the extraordinary origin for this city. One morning the Vestal Silvia (for what prevents starting from there?) was fetching water to wash the sacred images. She came toward the sloping bank by a gentle path; she removed the clay urn from the top of her head. Worn out, she lay back on the ground, and she welcomed the cool breezes by loosening her clothing at the neck, and she fixed her messy hair. While she sat there, the shady willows and the harmonious birds and the light murmur of water put her to sleep; pleasant rest stole over her overtaken eyes, and her hand, made sluggish, fell from her chin. Mars saw her and desired the one he saw and took possession of the one he desired, and he concealed his own trick with divine help. Her sleep ended, and she lies pregnant; certainly the founder of the Roman city is already within her innards. She rises lazily, and does not know why she rises lazily.⁶⁶

Rhea Silvia then speaks at some length of her dream, which was related above. The recounting of the dream immediately recalls Ennius' Ilia (compared below), but what I would like to address immediately is the pervasive gentleness of the experience. She has not suffered in the course of the rape, and she has no notion of misfortune that might lie in her future. Far from Livy's *ui compressa*, the violence has been removed from the conception itself; Romulus did not cause his mother suffering through his conception and therefore cannot accrue blame on that account--or so Ovid would have us believe.

Mars, not normally known for a particularly gentle touch, stands out in this episode for not waking his victim. Cf. Murgatroyd (2005) 91-2.

⁶⁶ *Fasti* 3.9-25.

Barchiesi has argued to the contrary, that, although Mars must consciously soften himself to cross genres from Ennius' epic *Annales* into the elegiac *Fasti*, the depiction of Rhea Silvia's rape in the *Fasti* is actually *more* explicit, and hence violent, than it is in Ennius' account.⁶⁷ Certainly Ovid maintains decorum by averting his eyes from the intimate details, in accordance with his practice in other rape stories. Nevertheless, I counter that even though the rape is described in a higher level of concrete detail, rather than vaguely alluded to as a dream, this level of detail is provided for the purpose of illustrating how gentle Mars was with Rhea Silvia, and the softening effect predominates.

In the depiction of the rape, I would call particular attention to the description of how the rape was precipitated. Addressing Mars, Ovid says *tunc quoque inermis eras, cum te Romana Sacerdos/cepit*.⁶⁸ The agency in this event is ascribed to Rhea Silvia;⁶⁹ it is she who "captures" Mars, not Mars who "captures" her or "takes away her modesty." The implication is that Rhea Silvia actively sought out Mars' sexual attention, even though Ovid admits just a few lines below that she fell asleep before he arrived and was impregnated without becoming aware of him. Ursini⁷⁰ compares this usage to similar statements about Propertius' Cynthia or Ovid's Corinna, as if Rhea Silvia were an elegiac *domina*, a decisive and calculating sexual personality who is aware of her effect on others and manipulates them to her advantage, which is not at all representative of the character

⁶⁷ Barchiesi (1997) 64: "the story, as [Ovid] tells it, amounts to nothing better than the open-air rape of a vestal virgin, scarcely redeemed by the complicity of a miraculous and sensual dream...the reader must also accept its transgressive and anti-epic nature." Likewise, Murgatroyd (2005) 91-2 argues that Rhea Silvia's rape in the *Fasti* has a subversive cast and portrays Mars in an unflattering light.

⁶⁸ *Fasti* 3.9-10.

⁶⁹ In a similar vein, Connors (1994) discusses how Ovid emphasizes the viewpoint of Rhea Silvia, even within a narrative related by Mars. The adoption of Rhea Silvia's perspective can be analogous to granting her, if not agency within the story, at least control over its interpretation.

⁷⁰ Ursini (2008) s.v. *Fasti* 3.10. Cf. also the description of Jupiter as *victus amore* in his conquest of Juturna (*Fasti* 2.585), although in that instance Juturna is not merely a sleepily passive victim; she actively flees Jupiter's advances.

or actions attributed to Rhea Silvia, here or anywhere else. Bailey rejects “captivated” as the meaning for *cepit* and suggests instead “embraced,”⁷¹ although the idea of embracing seems to require more agency than is possible for a sleeping woman. It is clear from the course of the narrative that Rhea Silvia was not a willing participant in her impregnation, but the way she is cast as the subject of *cepit* deflects the idea that any injury has occurred.

Indeed, although Rhea Silvia is generally presented in other accounts as a tragic figure (for example, in Ovid’s *Amores* or in Ennius’ *Annales*), this Rhea Silvia is spared all that unpleasantness--or at least, the reader is guided to look away from it. Ovid in the *Fasti* speaks of Rhea Silvia’s experience largely in circumlocutions; he states, *Silvia fit mater*⁷² and dwells for the four succeeding lines on how Vesta averted her eyes from the sacrilege Rhea Silvia committed by defiling her relics with non-virgin hands and giving birth in her shrine. Even so, Ovid guides the reader’s attention away from what fate lies in store for Rhea Silvia and turns the narrative toward the fate of her sons, their interactions with the wolf, their adoption by Faustulus, and their adventures as young men living in the vicinity of their malevolent uncle.⁷³ The reader may remember Rhea Silvia’s fate from the *Amores* and expect Ovid to treat this tragedy again when he follows the description of Rhea Silvia giving birth with *hoc ubi cognovit contemptor Amulius aequi...*⁷⁴ Yet the subsequent passage includes no remarks on the mother’s fate, only the twins’: *amne iube mergi geminos.*⁷⁵ Rhea Silvia’s life as a rape survivor--or her

⁷¹ Bailey (1921) s.v. *Fasti* 3.10.

⁷² *Fasti* 3.45.

⁷³ For Ovid’s construction of this episode and the closure of narrative arcs, see Murgatroyd (2005) 278-82.

⁷⁴ *Fasti* 3.49.

⁷⁵ The twins’ abandonment at the Tiber is related in somewhat more detail at *Fasti* 2.381-422, but Rhea Silvia is not included once she has set the twins afloat.

punishment for losing her virginity--is elided.⁷⁶ Thus the reader of the *Fasti* sees Rhea Silvia rise after her rape, unaware of what has happened to her or what lies in store for her. She does not know that her Vestal vows have been broken without her consent, nor that she will bear heroic twins but will not be able to witness their greatness, nor that she will suffer for the violence Mars perpetrated against her. There is a certain sympathy elicited from the reader when Ovid implies that Rhea Silvia continues to carry out her duty as a Vestal even after she has lost her virginity and is pregnant; Vesta is horrified at her priestess' lack of virginity, while the priestess herself is oblivious to it.

This reduction in violence is particularly significant because Rhea Silvia may in fact be the most eloquently unhappy rape survivor in all of Ovid--just not in this particular rendition. In *Amores* 3.6, Ovid describes in shocking detail the aftermath of Rhea Silvia's rape by Mars:

*Ilia cui placuit, quamuis erat horrida cultu
 ungue notata comas, ungue notata genas.
 illa gemens patruī nefas⁷⁷ delictaque Martis
 errabat nudo per loca sola pede.*

Ilia was attractive to [Anio], even though she was disheveled in appearance; her hair was rent by her nails, her cheeks were as well. Bewailing the wrongdoing of her uncle and the crimes of Mars, she was wandering alone and barefoot through the wilderness.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ Excluding *Am.* 3.6, the only ancient account of Rhea Silvia's life that gives any details of what happened after her childbearing/execution is Plutarch's *Romulus*, in which Rhea Silvia is specified to have her punishment commuted from death to imprisonment, and occasionally reappears in the story as the twins grow up.

⁷⁷ The sequence of events in this narrative is not entirely clear, and it is possible that Rhea Silvia has not come directly from her rape. Although the *delicta Martis* is almost certainly Mars' rape of Rhea Silvia (cf. Brandt (1911) 159), the *patruī nefas* is more obscure. Amulius is the author of a number of unsavory deeds, but it would be unusual to refer to most of them as *nefas*. Amulius did usurp Numitor's kingdom, and killed Numitor's son in the process (Livy 1.3.11), although he left Numitor himself alive; either the usurpation or the killing of his nephew could be construed as *nefas*. It may refer to the exposure of Romulus and Remus (as Brandt (1911) 159-60 claims), although it would be unusual to refer to infant exposure as *nefas*. Almost certainly Amulus' decision to force Rhea Silvia to become a Vestal Virgin or his condemnation of her for losing her virginity could not be construed as *nefas*.

⁷⁸ *Am.* 3.6.47-50.

Ilia has been raped and abandoned by Mars, and is, quite understandably, distressed by the situation. Not only has she been sexually violated, but, being a Vestal Virgin, she will be condemned to death if her rape is discovered, particularly if she becomes pregnant (as the reader knows is fated to happen). Unable to share her grief with anyone, she wanders in isolation with mounting panic, expressing her grief through self-mutilation. Although she thinks that her privately expressed distress is unobserved, she is disabused of this idea when the river god Anio rises from his banks and begins questioning her on all the subjects she wishes to conceal. His questioning, though ostensibly solicitous for her wellbeing, reveals a barely-concealed interest in her physical appearance, and a marked consciousness of her vulnerability while alone.

*'quid nostras' dixit 'teris anxia ripas,
 Ilia ab Idaeo Laomedonte genus?
 quo cultus abiere tui? quid sola uagaris,
 uitta nec euinctas impedit alba comas?
 quid fles et madidos lacrimis corrumpis ocellos
 pectoraque insana plangis aperta manu?
 ille habet et silices et uiuum in pectore ferrum,
 qui tenero lacrimis lentus in ore uidet.'*

He said, "Ilia, descended from Idaean Laomedon, why are you treading my banks fretfully? Why have your good looks deserted you? Why are you wandering alone, with no white headband to bind your hair neatly? Why are you crying, and why do you mar your moist eyes with tears, and why do you beat your exposed breast with your raging hand? The man who sees you with tears on your tender face and is unaffected surely has flint or living iron in his heart."⁷⁹

His interest in her physical appearance reveals his transparent attraction to her (*Ilia cui placuit*, above), and illustrates that his interest in her is not so innocuous as he would lead her to believe. As the confrontation goes on, the river grows more and more aggressive, taking advantage of her vulnerability to prevent her from leaving, and demanding that she interact with him against her will.

⁷⁹ *Am.* 3.6.53-60.

*dixerat; illa oculos in humum deiecta modestos
spargebat tepido flebilis imbre sinus;
ter molita fugam ter ad altas restitit undas
currendi uires eripiente metu.*

He said this; she, having cast down her modest eyes to the ground, was sprinkling her breast with warm water, a pitiable sight. Three times she attempted to flee; three times he interposed high waves, while fear took away her power to escape.⁸⁰

Rather than a sympathetic effort to comfort a woman in dire straits, Anio's

"conversation" with Rhea Silvia (in which, incidentally, she never addresses him) very quickly devolves into a pseudo-rape, reminiscent of the attack that any attractive woman might suffer from a river god when she carelessly decides to go for water alone.⁸¹ The story plays out with rising horror as the reader witnesses Rhea Silvia's distress and vulnerability, sees the river recognize that same vulnerability, and sees the river decide to take advantage of her because of that vulnerability. It is particularly repugnant that her vulnerability was specifically created by her earlier rape by Mars, that is, Rhea Silvia sought out solitude to recover from her rape and think over her problems, and that very solitude is what allows her to be victimized a second time. Rather than seeing Rhea Silvia "put aside her fear" (at 3.6.61-2 Anio twice says *Ilia, pone metus*), the reader sees Rhea Silvia's fear become more acute, and sees Anio take advantage of it to prevent her from escaping.

Once Rhea Silvia has been unavoidably prevented from leaving by this aggressive river god, she speaks for the first time in this poem, revealing a preoccupation with her persistent problems and a desire to have never encountered Mars in the first place. She

⁸⁰ *Am.* 3.6.67-70.

⁸¹ Tyro in *Odyssey* 11.235-59 is the most influential precedent for this stock plot.

does not address Anio, in fact barely acknowledges his presence; rather, she mourns her ruined reputation.

*sera tamen scindens inimico pollice crinem
edidit indignos ore tremente sonos:
'o utinam mea lecta forent patrioque sepulcro
condita, dum poterant uirginis ossa legi!
cur, modo Vestalis, taedas inuitor ad ullas
turpis et Iliacis infitianda focis?
quid moror et digitis designor adultera uolgi?
desint famosus quae notet ora pudor.'
hactenus, et uestem tumidis praetendit ocellis
atque ita se in rapidas perdita misit aquas;
supposuisse manus ad pectora lubricus amnis
dicitur et socii iura dedisse tori.
te quoque credibile est aliqua caluisse puella,
sed nemora et siluae crimina uestra tegunt.*

At last, tearing her hair with vicious fingers, she burst out with these undeserved words, her mouth trembling: "If only my bier had been laid in my ancestral tomb when my bones were still those of a virgin! Why, no longer a Vestal, am I invited to any torches, as a disgraced woman who must be revealed by the Trojan hearth? Why do I delay to be revealed as unchaste by the finger-pointing of the public? Let this face disappear, the one that scandalous shame marks out." She continued this far, and she covered her swollen eyes with her garment, and thus she threw herself, lost, into the swift waters; but the flowing river is said to have placed his hands on her chest and given her the rights of his conjugal bed. It is believable that you also [the addressee is an unnamed river god] burned with love for some girl, but the groves and woods concealed your crimes.⁸²

Although Fantham has identified Rhea Silvia's concession to Anio as a long lasting marriage-type arrangement,⁸³ Rhea Silvia's action seems to me much more suggestive of suicide.⁸⁴ Rather than endure the permanent damage to her reputation and the dishonor

⁸² *Am.* 3.6.71-84.

⁸³ Fantham (2009) 75: "Anio treats Ilia with more respect than we will observe in the Greek gods and river-gods who populate the *Metamorphoses*...he offers her what sounds like marriage." The question of which river Rhea Silvia married (Anio or Tiber) is complicated; Rutledge (1980b) 303 gives a summary of the sources.

⁸⁴ Green (1982) 320 notes the fact that in other versions, Rhea Silvia is executed by drowning; in this version, she commits suicide instead. He also notes that several of the stories mentioned in the set-up to this one differ in their details from better-known versions (specifically the stories of Peneius and Asopus), so it is not unusual that Rhea Silvia's story should also differ from the received tradition.

she perceives herself to have done to Vesta, she throws herself into the river.⁸⁵ In this speech, she makes a shocking contrast to Flora or the Sabine Women, who endorse their rape-initiated marriages; Rhea Silvia seems in no way satisfied or content to acquiesce to a marriage-type arrangement with Anio, and in fact seems willing to kill herself rather than suffer further. Even so, the marriage-type arrangement described by the river also implies an apotheosis: Rhea Silvia will become the subject of veneration by the nymphs and will continue alongside Anio as his consort (*supposuisse manus ad pectora lubricus amnis/dicitur et socii iura dedisse tori*). The violent elements here--her rape by Mars, her self-mutilation, her pseudo-rape by Anio, and her ostensible suicide--lead to a divine transformation and mark her out as the object of veneration *by other divinities*. If this is a happy ending as Ovid might want us to believe it is (after all, the narrator cites it as a worthy model of his own love for his mistress), the reader witnesses another rape transformation such as those suffered by any of the women in chapter three (combined with the self-inflicted violence present in Ino's story, discussed in the preceding chapter). It is striking, then, that Rhea Silvia's apotheosis has been omitted from the *Fasti*, which suggests that the elimination of violence from the narrative has caused the elimination of the transformation as well. The effect is that the reader of the *Fasti* is guided by the peaceful depiction of Mars' rape to believe that no harmful consequences will result from Rhea Silvia's pregnancy, even though the ominous tone suggested by the evil plot that Amulius visits upon the twins suggests the contrary. If the reader recalls Rhea Silvia's fate from the *Amores*, her future begins to look bleak indeed. But then again, this Rhea Silvia is not the same Rhea Silvia who meets us in the *Fasti*. The *Fasti*'s Rhea Silvia does

⁸⁵ Indeed, there is a suggestion of a divide between human and divine perception in this passage, to the effect that Rhea Silvia does not perceive the river anthropomorphically and does not hear his address to her, but only sees the aggressive motion of the waves and is subtly persuaded to throw herself into the water.

not lurch through the woods alone, tearing her hair and agonizing over how to go on. On the contrary, she rises gracefully from the riverbank and, still unaware that she has been raped, wonders how she slept so soundly.

It would be more instructive, however, to put these narratives in context. In the *Fasti*, the rape account is narrated by Mars, the rapist himself, who has an interest in minimizing the distress that he caused his victim--he may not have even been aware of the trouble he caused her. The account from the *Amores*, on the other hand, is narrated by the authorial persona, and the audience is a river god.⁸⁶ The narrator is complaining that the river is in flood and consequently prevents him from visiting his mistress; in effort to persuade the river to recede, he reminds the river of the various stories of rivers falling in love (most of which, incidentally, are rape stories on the same model as Tyro): Inachus and Melie, Xanthus and Neaera, Peneus and Creusa, Asopus and Thebe, Achelous and Deianira, Nilus and Euanthe, Enipeus and Tyro.⁸⁷ At last he describes Anio's "seduction" of Rhea Silvia. The river's treatment of Rhea Silvia, his transparent arousal by her appearance and inability to restrain himself from taking advantage of her, illustrates an implied parallel to the narrator's irrepressible need to visit his mistress and, presumably, have sex with her. The narrator further suggests that The river had also committed *crimina* (3.6.83-4) similar to Anio's and that they remained undiscovered. In doing so, the narrator asks the river to identify with his predicament, and in doing so reveals the "boy's club" mentality that he attributes to the river and implies that he shares with the river. He makes clear that he has a non-negotiable need to have sex with his mistress, and

⁸⁶ Green (1982) 317: "We do not know the location of the river which suggested these lines (if, indeed, it was not pure literary invention): Sulmona is one possibility, but Ovid's travels in Asia Minor and Sicily could well have included just such a *contretemps*."

⁸⁷ *Am.* 3.6.25-44.

none of her protests or lamentations will stand in his way, even if the waters of the River will. In contrast, when Rhea Silvia's rape is revised in the *Fasti*, nothing violent has happened: Rhea Silvia's rape by Mars has been transformed into a harmless afternoon nap, she does not balefully lament it, and her grief is not seized upon by Anio as an occasion for further violation. The jocular tone of mutual understanding has been cleared away to clean up the violence--even winked-at violence--from the story.

It is useful to compare both of these Rhea Silvias with her counterpart from Ennius' *Annales*. In one of the longest surviving passages from Ennius' early history of Rome, Rhea Silvia describes her rape to her half-sister.

*Talia tum memorat lacrimans, exterrita somno:
'Eurydica prognata, pater quam noster amavit,
Vires uitaque corpus meum nunc deserit omne.
Nam me uisus homo pulcher per amoena salicta
Et ripas raptare locosque novos. Ita sola
Postilla, germana soror, errare uidebar
Tardaque uestigare et quaerere te neque posse
Corde capessere: semita nulla pedem stabilibat.
Exim compellare pater me uoce uidetur
His uerbis: "o gnata, tibi sunt ante gerendae
Aerumnae, post ex fluuio fortuna resistet."
Haec ecfatus pater, germana, repente recessit
Nec sese dedit in conspectum corde cupitus,
Quamquam multa manus ad caeli caerula templa
Tendebam lacrumans et blanda uoce uocabam.
Vix aegro cum corde meo me somnus reliquit.'*

Then, having been frightened out of sleep, [Rhea Silvia] tearfully related such things: "Daughter of Eurydice, dear sister, whom our father cherished, now life and strength have abandoned my entire body. In my dream I saw a magnificent man carry me away through lovely willow groves and riverbanks and strange places. After that, sister, I saw myself wander alone and search in exhaustion and look for you, though I was unable to reach you with my heart, for no reliable path secured my feet. Afterward I saw our father admonish me with these words: 'My daughter, first you must endure difficulties, but afterward your luck will rise up, on account of a river.' When our father had said these things, sister, suddenly he went away and, though I wished wholeheartedly to see him, he did not come into my sight, even though I repeatedly lifted my hands to the blue

heavens while weeping and was begging with a persuasive voice. Scarcely has sleep left me, and my heart is still troubled.”⁸⁸

Both of Ovid’s Rhea Silvias seem to be derived from this passage,⁸⁹ although their substantially different depictions in the two Ovidian episodes reflect different aspects of Ennius’ work. Ennius’ Rhea Silvia clearly attests to her distress at having been raped, her rejection from her community, and the difficulties (*aerumnae*) that lie inevitably in her future, just as the reader sees her enumerate in the *Amores*. The *Amores*’ Rhea Silvia is witnessed acting out the very events that the *Annales*’ Rhea Silvia foresees in her future. Nevertheless, the depiction of her rape as a dream (which is for that reason cast as harmless despite its distressing premonitions), recalls the Rhea Silvia of the *Fasti*, who is raped in her sleep and arises unaware that anything is amiss. Curiously, one will note that there is actually little overlap between the plots of Ovid’s Rhea Silvia stories as opposed to Ennius’. While, in the *Fasti*, Rhea Silvia goes for water in the daytime, falls asleep at the riverbank, and is raped by Mars without waking, Ennius’ Rhea Silvia is sleeping at night in her bedroom in the ordinary, irreproachable way, and dreams that an unnamed *homo pulcher* carries her through a river-like landscape, and hears an ominous pronouncement from her father. There is a dreamlike conceptual connection between the two accounts--Connors speaks of Ennius’ account as the traditional version turned inside-out⁹⁰--but Ovid is not following Ennius’ example in any straightforward fashion, and the ominous promise of difficulties in the future has been entirely removed.

⁸⁸ *An.* 1.35-50 (Skutsch).

⁸⁹ Ovid in general seems to have taken a deprecating view of Ennius’ *Annales* (*nil est hirsutius illis!* he exclaims at *Tr.* 2.259); nevertheless, their appearance as a source for his descriptions of Rhea Silvia attests to their importance to him as part of the literary tradition, cf. Skutsch 15-6.

⁹⁰ Connors (1994) 104. Stearns (1927) 31-4 classifies both Dido’s nightmare in the *Aen.* and Ennius’ Ilia’s pregnancy-dream as “allegorical dreams” on the landscape of dreams in Latin epic and drama; however, Stearns declines to address any dream in the works of Ovid in any detail.

It is noteworthy as well that the rape of Rhea Silvia is followed so closely in the *Fasti* by the rape of the Sabine Women; the two episodes occur in quick succession at the beginning of the month of March, incorporated into the poem by their connections to Mars. The role of Mars in the *Fasti* as relates to the generic identity of the poem has been extensively examined:⁹¹ traditionally Mars is not at home in elegiac works, and must conscientiously disarm before he is invited to converse with Ovid. Harries, in particular, has noted the reluctance with which Mars seems to approach these stories about himself, claiming that “We may surmise that Mars is not anxious for us to make [an association between the rapes of Rhea Silvia and the Sabine Women] which hardly reflects well on either himself or his son.”⁹² I am unconvinced that the Rape of Rhea Silvia as related in the *Fasti* reflects on Romulus as poorly as Harries seems to assume; among the rape narratives of the *Fasti*, Mars is (interestingly) one of the least violent perpetrators. Certainly the audience never sees the unfortunate consequences that must inevitably follow for Rhea Silvia. Still I would agree with Harries that the rape Mars perpetrates may suffer in comparison to that which his son does; Harries⁹³ states that Mars’ rape is “not carried out on any socio-economic pretext like Romulus’ but simply to satisfy a sexual impulse;” in this way, his rape is characteristic of the inelegance and lack of premeditation that infest the *Fasti* rapes.⁹⁴

Although Rhea Silvia’s rape is described in the *Fasti* as an unwelcome sexual assault by the god of war, the rape is nevertheless softened in terms of physical discomfort and is thus represented as minimally unpleasant to the victim. This has the

⁹¹ Hinds (1992b), Barchiesi (1997), Murgatroyd (2005) 37-9.

⁹² Harries (1989) 176.

⁹³ Harries (1989) 176.

⁹⁴ See my discussion in the following chapter.

effect of excusing the rape by minimizing Romulus' role as an agent of suffering and his father's violent nature (which presumably would be inherited by his son). Overall it works with other effects in the *Fasti* that revise Roman legend to improve Romulus' reputation, and thereby paint Romulus as a respectable model for Augustus to follow, and ultimately outshine.

Beyond the description of her rape, Rhea Silvia appears few other places in the *Fasti*, but the places in which she does appear are significant. When Jupiter instructs the nymphs to assist in his quest to rape Juturna, the authorial voice identifies the nymphs as *quaeque colunt thalamos, Ilia diva, tuos*.⁹⁵ The description of Rhea Silvia as *diva* is striking enough, but the reference to her *thalami* clearly invokes her earlier rape narrative. As McDonough remarks,⁹⁶ there are a number of similarities between Rhea Silvia's story and Lara's, significantly the bearing of twins and the twins' significance in Roman religion. But the description of Ilia as a *diva*, and moreover one who possesses the riverbanks, uncomfortably recalls how she acquired that authoritative role: like Lara, or Juturna, she had to suffer violence that deprived her of power. The idea of transformative violence is subtly suffused into Juturna's story in this muted reference that recalls Rhea Silvia's confrontation with Anio in the *Ars Amatoria*, and prefigures her rape by Mars that will follow in book 3 of the *Fasti*.

The reader of the *Fasti* may come away from the text with an impression of Romulus as a well-intentioned leader, who focused on what was good for his populace, and regretted instances in which his good intentions went awry. In the texts that established precedent for Ovid, Romulus comes off as a much more ambiguous character,

⁹⁵ *Fasti* 2.598.

⁹⁶ McDonough (2004) 361.

whose intentions may be less noble than Ovid makes them in the *Fasti*. While not necessarily wicked, the Romulus constructed by Livy and Ennius is certainly more likely to draw the ire of other characters, and less likely to experience regret in consequence.

CHAPTER 3

TRANSFORMATION VIA RAPE

The *Fasti* contains several stories in which rape appears as the violence that catalyzes supernatural transformation for the victim. These episodes tend to have very similar plot structures, and in their similarity, they comprise a distinct subset of transformation stories within the *Fasti*, not only because the violence on offer is specifically sexual, but also because the violence is never ultimately averted. In these stories, one never sees the model of a character being subject to violence from an outside force and a god coming to the rescue before the violence can do harm; on the contrary, the god appears as the violent force and perpetrates that violence in the form of rape before the character is supernaturally transformed. Consistently, when the rapes result in a transformation, the rape must actually be completed and the victim must suffer the violence before she can be transformed; there is no possibility of last-minute salvation. There are stories in which a rape is averted, but these do not result in transformations. It is also significant that in all of these stories, the rape victim is specified (or at least implied) to be a nymph or some low-level divinity, and the transformation is a promotion to a level of greater power and status, rather than an apotheosis proper. The stories do vary considerably in terms of the sources who narrate them and the light in which the stories are portrayed, that is, whether they are depicted as beneficial or harmful for the

person transformed. This chapter will examine the transformative process in the rape episodes, the common elements of the transformations and the variations in how the stories are depicted.

To begin, it is no secret that stories of rape are pervasive in the works of Ovid.¹ Rape as an Ovidian theme has been studied in detail by such scholars as Leo Curran, Julia Hejduk, Amy Richlin, Paul Murgatroyd, Alison Keith, and Shilpa Raval; Curran stresses that the *Metamorphoses* “is not a treatise on rape,”² but any work that contains more than fifty rapes³ over the course of fifteen books cannot help in some way being about rape and revealing violence towards women as one of its essential qualities. Since the *Metamorphoses* is home to the majority of Ovid’s rape narratives, and since in the *Fasti* the prevalence of rape is only slightly diminished, and the form of the rape narratives frequently resembles that of the Metamorphosean rapes, scholars (such as Richlin) often discuss the two works in concert, as if the *Fasti* were only an appendix to the *Metamorphoses*.⁴ Nevertheless, I will be restricting my discussion to the *Fasti*, and only using the *Metamorphoses* as a point of comparison, because the rapes in the *Fasti* follow conventions distinct from those of the *Metamorphoses*, and they are restricted to a narrower range of forms. The *Fasti* rapes give a very different impression when separated

¹ Fox (1996) remarks on Ovid’s “preference for certain kinds of stories” (i.e., rape narratives) within the *Fasti*: “The greater care given to the story of the rape suggests a concern for the kinds of historical events that lend themselves to an elegiac treatment and a deliberate neglect of historical contexts and the intricacies of the historical cohesion of events. It is a neglect that is marked through...the disappointed expectation that Ovid would be reproducing Livy” (Fox 211-2).

² Curran (1978) 214.

³ Curran (1978) 214 counts “some fifty or so occurrences of forcible rape, attempted rape, or sexual extortion hardly distinguishable from rape,” but does not include a list of citations. Murgatroyd (2000) 75 for his part counts thirty-one rapes in the Ovidian corpus, including nineteen in the *Met.* and ten in the *Fasti*; citations are included.

⁴ Salzman (1998), at least, observes a consistent difference between the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* in the way that apotheoses are depicted, arguing that the *Fasti* depictions of apotheoses are consistently more reverent and positive than their counterparts in the *Metamorphoses*. Unfortunately, Salzman does not address any of the rape narratives that I will discuss in this chapter.

from the *Metamorphoses* rapes than they do when jumbled up with them, since the *Fasti* rapes emphatically repeat certain narrative structures and omit others.

To wit, the rape episodes in the *Fasti* can be generally divided into two groups. On the one hand, the failed rapes perpetrated by Faunus and Priapus in the *Fasti* are presented as farcical episodes,⁵ and--though they represent an unwarranted invasion of the victim's person--result in no lasting harm to or transformation of the victim. On the other, the completed rapes, the ones that unambiguously violate the victims, are persistently linked to the supernatural, and usually result in a transformation on the part of the woman raped. My concern lies not in the "comic" failed rapes, but the transformative completed ones.⁶ There is a very simple model of transformation here, in which a woman is raped by a god and is granted apotheosis as compensation; the woman in question suffers violence, and gains apotheosis as a consequence. One should note from the start one clear distinction between the rapes in the *Fasti* and those in the *Metamorphoses*. In both works, rape is often a catalyzing event that provokes a supernatural transformation. However, In the *Fasti*, the transformation is generally a promotion on the universal scale: the woman becomes a nymph or a goddess and gains greater power than she had before the change (the cases of Flora, Lara, Carna, and Persephone will be examined in detail). In the *Metamorphoses*, on the contrary, the transformations usually involve a decrease in power and prestige, effectively a demotion on the universal scale. This may entail a transformation into a plant, body of water, or inanimate object as a means to thwart an attempted rape (as in the cases of Daphne,

⁵ Cf. particularly Murgatroyd (2005) 74-81 and Hejduk (2011).

⁶ In chapter one I contrast narratives in which a character is subject to imminent danger or death, and the gods intervene to prevent this danger by means of apotheosis. Note the difference: in the intervention model, the gods act to prevent the character from suffering violence; in the rape model, the gods are themselves instigating the violence, and require it as a rite of passage before the apotheosis can occur.

Arethusa, Syrinx, and many others), or it may even involve a punitive transformation after the rape is completed (such as Io and Callisto's transformations into animals). The only exceptions, the rape victims who experience demotion in the *Fasti* or promotion in the *Metamorphoses*, are the ones who experience both phenomena: Io and Callisto, who experience punitive transformation into animals before they are apotheosed.⁷ The divergent consequences of transformative rapes between the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* underline the fact that these collections of rape stories should be considered separately and not casually jumbled together. While in the *Metamorphoses* rape, even attempted rape, is, for the victim, not just an evil in itself⁸ but also a gateway to further suffering and misery by way of loss of power, in the *Fasti* the unpleasantness of rape is usually quickly swept away and forgotten, with an empowering transformation presented as compensation for the victim's suffering.

In this vein, it is necessary to call attention to one obvious point: though the works of Ovid contain a great many rape victims, they contain comparatively few rape survivors.⁹ By which I mean, the stories as narrated generally do not recount, nor do they

⁷ Io, of course, appears in the *Metamorphoses* and not the *Fasti*, whereas Callisto appears in both works. Callisto's transformations in the *Fasti* do not easily fit the same model as the rape stories that are the focus of this chapter, for which reason she will be discussed individually in chapter four.

⁸ Parry (1964) discusses rape as a manifestation of violence that is latent in the narrative whenever any isolated woodland setting is established. In the *Fasti* this same isolated woodland setting seems to be activated as a locus for danger and the threat of violence or rape (as in the cases of Juturna, Persephone, Flora, and Carna), but whereas Ovid in the *Met.* establishes the *locus amoenus* with detailed ecphrasis, in the *Fasti* the *locus amoenus* is generally only implied with minimal detail (see, for example, Flora's rape, in which the *locus amoenus* is only implied in the phrase *ver erat* (5.201)).

⁹ Part of the reason for this is that violated women often commit suicide: Lefkowitz (1986) in chapter six of her book discusses the "Martyr" type in Greek myth, detailing many examples of male-narrated women who vested all their worth in their chastity, and are portrayed as exalted because they killed themselves to stave off the prospect of rape (for example, Iphigenia, Polyxena). In this way, women are accorded more respect for their refusal to endure rape than for their resilience to survive and recover from it, and the woman's sexual integrity is portrayed as more valuable than the woman per se. Suicide in such cases is portrayed as the equivalent of going to war, despite the fact that warriors are heralded as courageous for undertaking a risk that they might survive, whereas women who commit suicide effectively give up before they can face such a risk. More often, though, particularly in Ovid, no suggestion of suicide is apparent, and

betray any concern regarding, the victims' struggles to recover from the physical and psychological trauma of being raped, re-integrate to society, and bring their attackers to justice.¹⁰ Despite his frequent descriptions of women who were impregnated by rape, Ovid shows little interest in how they made peace with the idea of bearing their rapists' sons or raising children over whose creation they had no control and whose existence they may resent. This illustrates a short-sighted vision of rape, one that pities the tragedy of one night's violation without considering the decades of consequences to follow: the feeding and care and education of a child until the child becomes a self-sufficient adult, the ostracism from a community that values virginity or chastity as the only virtues worth mentioning in praise of a woman, the dependence of most women upon a marriage structure for economic support and the consequent inability of most women to support themselves (particularly when they simultaneously need to care for children, often with little help from their community), not to mention the long-established double standard for sexual behavior between men and women.

Nevertheless, the supernatural rapes in the *Fasti* do tend to have conclusions that, at the very least, hint at the future of these women as rape survivors, and generally these futures are not happy ones. In this chapter I examine the rapes of Lara, Flora, Carna, and

the reader must presume that the character remains alive, although the author has turned away from the story.

¹⁰ Gaca succinctly summarized the fact that rape, when consequent upon other violence (such as warfare), in historical accounts is often brushed aside with little or no attention because "the objectives of warfare as a lethal contest among men have generally been portrayed as having little or nothing to do with a sexual lust for power...the aggravated sexual assault of captive women and girls through warfare and the resultant subjugation of female survivors can only have been an ancillary byproduct of warfare, and as such of no more interest in elucidating the historical genesis of Western warfare than the production of sawdust is to grasping the practices and goals of carpentry" (Gaca (2011) 77). This is a sober cast on Darcos' (2009) description of the *Fasti* as "l'aventure divine mêlée à notre monde quotidien" (361).

Persephone,¹¹ which are linked by the centrality of rape in the stories, the stories' dark resolutions, and the transformations of the victims.¹² Even when a transformation results in a nominal gain in status, for example, in the case of Persephone, the transformation into the wife of a major god and queen of the underworld is darkened by the fact of where she will assume this authority: it is clear that Ceres does not want her daughter isolated in the underworld, and Persephone likely would prefer to remain in the upper world as well.¹³ Still, in interpreting these unfortunate resolutions, the reader must remember that on the whole these stories feature victims who have very little political or religious significance per se contemporary to Ovid,¹⁴ for which reason these stories can be seen as primarily a source of entertainment rather than as object lessons to be applied to the audience's life. While the victims may elicit empathy from the reader, the reader is little invited to identify with these unfortunate women, and their stories may seem like a baroque flourish of poetics rather than a meaningful insight into the character.

One major difference between the cumulative effect of the rape stories in the *Metamorphoses* as opposed to the *Fasti* is the studied change in the representation of violence. In neither poem are rapes described in particularly violent detail; one of the most explicitly violent rapes in either poem may be the rape of Callisto in the

¹¹ Respectively, their narratives are given at *Fasti* 2.585-616, 5.195-212, 6.105-128, and 4.417-618. There is also a very strong connection between these stories and the rape of Callisto, examined in the final chapter.

¹² By re-examining the rapes of the *Fasti* from the perspective of the victims, I am undertaking a "resisting" reading of the sort advocated by Fetterley (1978) xi-xii, xix-xxiv. Cf. Liveley (1999). There is of course an extensive body of literature on women and gender roles in Roman elegy (see e.g. James (1997)); however, such literature tends to treat the stereotyped roles of love elegy, the elegiac *domina* and the *servus amoris*, a model that does not usefully apply to the female characters of the didactic-elegiac *Fasti*.

¹³ Persephone's own reaction to her rape is very strongly downplayed in the *Fasti* description of the event; v.inf.

¹⁴ Regarding Lara, Robinson (2011:370-4), among others (Bömer (1958) 301) has noted the importance of the Lares Compitales in the Augustan program of religious reform, but the identity of the Mater Larum, as demonstrated by Robinson (ibid.) and Tabeling (1975:68-81 and passim), is very obscure, and if Ovid is trying to use her to make a point about the cult of the Lares Compitales, he is doing so in a very oblique way. v.inf.

Metamorphoses, when the reader sees Jupiter approach the nymph in the guise of Diana and grow increasingly aggressive towards her.

*oscula iungit
nec moderata satis nec sic a uirgine danda.
qua uenata foret silua narrare parantem
impedit amplexu, nec se sine crimine prodit.
illa quidem contra, quantum modo femina posset
(aspiceres utinam, Saturnia: mitior esses),
illa quidem pugnat; sed quem superare puella,
quisue Iouem poterat? superum petit aethera uictor
Iuppiter; huic odio nemus est et conscia silua...*

He gave kisses that were overeager, and not the sort that should be given by a virgin. When [Callisto] was trying to describe in which forest she had been hunting, he prevented her with his embrace, and revealed his offensive intentions.¹⁵ She indeed fought back, but only as much as a woman is able (Juno, if you had seen it, you would have been gentler), but whom is a girl able to defeat, and who is able to defeat Jupiter? Victorious Jupiter departed for the upper air, but for her the grove is a source of hatred, and the woods are accomplices...¹⁶

Despite the muted violence of the rapes, in the *Metamorphoses* violence nevertheless tends to emerge out of these rape stories, as if the unspeakable violence of the rape were transposed in the narrative onto some other offense.¹⁷ The best example of this transposition is Tereus' rape of Philomela, in which the rape itself is given in muted detail, but the narrator lingers savagely on Tereus' mutilation of his victim, and on metaphors that describe predatory mutilation rather than rape. The decorum¹⁸ that will shield the readers from seeing rape will do nothing to protect them from seeing Philomela's tongue twitching on the floor.

*rex Pandione natam
in stabula alta trahit, siluis obscura vetustis,
atque ibi pallantem trepidamque et cuncta trementem*

¹⁵ Or perhaps more literally, he revealed himself, that is, his identity and his genitalia.

¹⁶ *Met.* 2.430-38.

¹⁷ Richlin (1992) 162-4.

¹⁸ What I am glibly passing over as "decorum," Raval (1998:133-8) has read as a more systematic method of transposing the description of sexual violence into other, less sexual modes.

*et iam cum lacrimis ubi sit germana rogan-
 tem includit fassusque nefas et uirginem et unam
 ui superat, frustra clamato saepe parente,
 saepe sorore sua, magnis super omnia diuis.
 illa tremit uelut agna pauens quae saucia cani
 ore excussa lupi nondum sibi tuta uidetur,
 utque columba suo madefactis sanguine plumis
 horret adhuc auidosque timet quibus haeserat ungu-
 es.
 mox ubi mens rediit, passos laniata capillos,
 [lugenti similis, caesis plangore lacertis,
 intendens palmas 'o diris barbarentis,
 o crudelis' ait...
 talibus ira feri postquam commota tyranni
 nec minor hac metus est, causa stimulatus utraque,
 quo fuit accinctus uagina liberat ensem
 arreptamque coma flexis post terga lacertis
 uincla pati cogit. iugulum Philomela parabat
 spemque suae mortis uiso conceperat ense;
 ille indignantem et nomen patris usque uocantem
 luctantemque loqui comprehensam forcipe linguam
 abstulit ense fero. radix micat ultima linguae,
 ipsa iacet terraeque tremens immurmurat atrae.*

The king [Tereus] dragged the daughter of Pandion into a secluded stable, hidden in an ancient forest, and there locked her up, while she was pale and shaking and fearing everything and asking, now with tears, where her sister was; he, having admitted his crime, overcame the girl with force, while she called in vain for help, sometimes from her father, sometimes from her sister, but most of all on the great gods. She shook like a fearful lamb which, having been wounded, taken out of the gray wolf's mouth, still does not think herself safe, or like a dove shakes when its wings are wet with its own blood, and still fears those grasping talons in which it was snatched. As soon as she came back to herself, having loosed her hair, like a person in mourning, with her arms raked, holding up her arms she said, "Oh, barbarian of the terrible deeds, oh tormentor..." At these words the anger of the wicked king was aroused, nor less was his fear, and, driven on by both emotions, he drew the sword with which he was equipped out of its sheath, with her arms bent behind her back, having seized her by her hair, he forces her to put on bonds. Philomela bears her throat and conceives a hope of death when she sees the sword, but he with his unrestrained sword took away her tongue, having seized it with a pinch, while it was still insulting him and calling her father's name and trying to speak. The very root of the tongue shines, it itself lies on the black ground and, quivering, still murmurs.¹⁹

In addition to these examples of transposed violence, Raval argues that in the

Metamorphoses the violence of punitive transformation (for example, Io into a cow or

Callisto into a bear) is used as a narrative surrogate for the violence of rape:²⁰ like

¹⁹ *Met.* 6.520-34, 549-58.

²⁰ Raval (1998) 87-94.

Philomela's tongue twitching on the floor, the victim's transformation into an animal is described minutely. This model is not apparent in the *Fasti*, not only because the *Fasti* contains only one rape victim who is transformed into an animal (Callisto), but even when Callisto is transformed, her transformation into a bear is not given in such unpleasant detail as it is in the *Metamorphoses*.²¹ In the *Fasti*, not only is the violence of rape usually elided, but the violence of punitive transformation does not appear as a surrogate for the absent rape violence, either. One cannot say that rape violence is never transposed onto another type of violence in the *Fasti*--we see Lara's tongue torn out just like Philomela's²²--but it is true that in the *Fasti*, transformation is almost never cast as punitive. When women are raped in the *Fasti*, they are usually not transformed into bears or cows, but more often they are elevated among the goddesses. The rape, then, is presented as an ennobling experience, as if it invests the victims with power and authority.

It is also noteworthy that, compared to other rapes in ancient narratives, even within the works of Ovid, the *Fasti* rapes as a collection are surprisingly inelegant. There is little attempt made to beguile, persuade, deceive, or seduce the victims; most of them are raped by means of force, with very little discussion by way of prelude. Even in the cases in which the rapes are premeditated, the rapists generally plot a straightforward means of attack: they plan (in the cases of Faunus or Priapus) to approach the woman once she has fallen asleep and to overpower her. Even Jupiter in his quest after Juturna is not shown in the narrative to make any sort of persuasive overture; he simply announces

²¹ *Fasti* 2.179-81: *utque ferae vidit turpes in paelice [Callisto] voltus, / 'huius in amplexus, Iuppiter,' inquit [Iuno] 'eas. / ursa per incultos errabat squalida montes...*

²² *Fasti* 2.607-8: *Iuppiter intumuit, quaque est non usa modeste/eripit huic linguam*. McDonough (2004:364) stresses (following Newlands 1995:162) how the connection between these two women is reinforced when Philomela is mentioned by the narrator shortly after Lara's mutilation is completed.

to the nymphs that he is having trouble physically catching her.²³ In fact, the rapist who makes the most articulate attempt at seduction is Sextus Tarquinius, who spends a significant length of the narrative attempting to persuade Lucretia to commit adultery with him, before he overcomes her with threats and the prospect of shame. But in most cases (for example, Lara, Persephone, or Flora) the bald coercion on display as a means of rape is breathtaking. These repeated acts of inarticulate coercion work to further simplify the rape narrative in deference to ‘decorum,’ with the result of focusing attention on the immediate result. In the case of Carna, for example, the rapist does not speak until *after* he has raped her, promising her an elevated position as a goddess adjunct to him: the reader’s attention is diverted from the regrettable offense onto her more powerful future.

As far as the supernatural or transformative aspect of rape goes, there can be no question that in antiquity sex in general or the loss of virginity was seen as a transformative event per se in a woman’s life.²⁴ Marriage or loss of virginity usually implied a change to a new status in life: not only the transitions to a new house, a new family, an increase or decrease in social status and reputation (depending on whether the sex occurred illicitly or not), but also, often, the loss of virginity implied a transition to motherhood. The mystique of motherhood is prevalent in mythological stories, and the multitude of attendant or alternative supernatural transformations that might occur alongside loss of virginity--death, catasterism, apotheosis, the acquisition of supernatural abilities--evidence the transformative power that ancient mythographers saw in sex. In this light, the ability of rape, or even consensual sex, to transform a woman

²³ *Fasti* 2.585-96.

²⁴ Gentilcore (1995), in discussing Ovid’s *Met.*, identifies “the violent and destructive nature of love” (Gentilcore 110).

supernaturally needs little explanation; if conception itself is seen as a supernatural event, the attendance of other supernatural events upon it may follow logically. This is not to imply that rape is the only means to supernatural transformation available; in the *Fasti*, the reader also sees premeditated murder, violation of guest-friendship, and averted violence as vehicles for apotheosis. Rape nevertheless occupies a particular prominence in the transformation stories of the *Fasti*, particularly as a vehicle for women's apotheosis: no men in the *Fasti* are apotheosed by sexual means, but rape is the most common means by which women are transformed.

It may be admitted that, on the surface, the *Fasti* is not a particularly violent poem. In most cases, the violence included by way of rape, murder, ambushes, attacks, or other means is glossed over, implied, or elided; the reader hears only the barest details, if details appear at all. This delicacy forces the reader, in most cases, to make his or her own assumptions about the degree of violence exercised, and can lead to widely varying impressions of the text depending on how long the reader is willing to ponder unpleasant details. It also forces some strange conclusions about the narrative construction, insofar as Ovid seems to consider a high degree of violence necessary to the supernatural transformations but simultaneously skirts away from relating it; he seems to feel obligated to include the violence but not to want to discuss it. This delicacy might be glibly dismissed on the grounds of decorum--Ovid, in deference to genre, keeps the graphic realities of rape or murder to a minimum. Still, there is a significant dimension to this reticence: it allows the reader to pass over the unpleasantness quickly, to absorb its significance as a plot device with minimal consideration of how invasive and atrocious the experience is for the person suffering it. Such casual use of such a devastating event

inclines the readers to pass over it without much thought, again and again and again, as many times as Ovid shows his readers Callisto desperately trying to ward off Jupiter's attack.

In studies of contemporary rape and societal attitudes toward it, an important term is "rape myth," which refers to the popular narrative, highly unrepresentative of reality, of how the typical rape is committed.²⁵ Rape myth can be contradicted in contemporary studies by examination of reported sexual assaults; one can construct, via law enforcement data, court proceedings, and sociological studies, a reasonably accurate idea of what sort of sexual crimes occur in modern society. Unfortunately, in the ancient world, we do not have access to that wealth of data; in the Roman sphere, firsthand accounts of historical rapes are essentially absent, and even the information that can be gathered from the Athenian orators is sporadic and unreliable as a mirror of the scope of Athenian sexual crimes. Instead of historical data, descriptions of rape from antiquity come out of such sources as hypothetical legal arguments from Seneca, melodramatic stories from the Greek novels, and fantastic myths reported by Ovid and others. Absent a counternarrative of historical fact, it's *all* rape myth in ancient history: the narratives of rape that we have are neither written nor reported by victims, but are constructed as a popular conception of what rape is expected to be like--whether it actually is that way or not.

While I do wish to trouble the modern reading of rape in antiquity, I do not wish to stray too far into anachronism, so allow me to clarify a few points. First, while the

²⁵ Some prominent examples of rape myth are the ideas that most rapists are unknown to their victims (while in reality most rapists are already acquainted with their victims), or that rape is an outlet of pent-up sexual desire (rather than a desire to assert power). For a full discussion of modern rape myth, see Reddington and Kreisel (2005) 14-23.

concept of non-consensual sex existed in antiquity with a sense similar to that of the modern idea of sexual assault, the defining characteristics of rape as a legal concept have substantially changed. Most prominently, in ancient law, rape of a woman was not defined by the victim's²⁶ willingness or unwillingness to engage in sexual acts, but rather by the decision of the man who had legal control of her: marital rape, for example, could not exist, because the husband had legal authority over his wife's sexual behavior. Wives could be raped, as could unmarried women, but only in such cases as the rapist was someone whom the woman's husband or guardian did not want to have sexual access to her. As Fantham makes clear, the rape is legally treated as an offense against the woman's family, rather than against the woman herself.²⁷ In these circumstances, it is the idea of consent that has changed: legal consent in the ancient world is not granted by a woman engaging in sexual acts, but rather by the man who has authority over her. Moreover, for Roman legal purposes, most unlawful sexual activity (adultery, seduction, rape, pederasty with freeborn Roman boys) is grouped without differentiation under the title *stuprum*, and the woman's consent was immaterial to the legal definition of the

²⁶ In the interest of efficiency, I will be referring to the rape victims as female and the rapists as male, for two reasons. First, the *Fasti* contains no narratives with female rapists, and Ganymede as a male rape victim is only briefly alluded to; his story is not narrated at any length. (Hermaphroditus is a useful comparandum from the *Met.*, but does not appear in the *Fasti*). Second, the social and legal ramifications are substantially different for female versus male victims, and, in the absence of any male victims, it is more efficient to discuss only the consequences that are relevant to the narratives.

²⁷ Fantham (1991) 270: "Whereas our society conceives an adult woman as capable of giving or withholding consent to intercourse and essentially responsible only to herself, Roman law saw the young man or woman in a father's household not as *sui iuris* but as subject to his consent." Dixon (2001) 51 outlines the offense of *raptus* (codified by Constantine) by saying "The crime is...defined as a theft from the parents rather than as physical violence or an infringement of the girl's personal rights." Cf. Williams (2010) 130: "Scholars generally agree that during the Republic there was no fixed procedure for penalizing acts of *stuprum*...the offense was a private matter, and punishment was meted out at the discretion of the *paterfamilias*." Cf. Gardner (1991) 117-25; Moses (1993) 45-9. For similar sentiments in Athenian law, see Omitowaju (2002) 25-8 and *passim*.

crime.²⁸ Harrison sums up this concept well when he says that “The scale along which sexual relations were judged and controlled...was not one that ran between non-consensual intercourse and romantic, reciprocated love, but between one form of non-consensual intercourse and another.”²⁹

Even if women did not have access to the legal concept of consent, one cannot presume that ancient men had no appreciation of a woman’s consent to intercourse (as an informal concept with no legal standing). One of the most succinct summaries of an ancient perspective on consent comes from Herodotus. In the context of the rapes of Io and Europa, he presents the following as the Persians’ perspective on the rapes: δῆλα γὰρ δὴ ὅτι, εἰ μὴ αὐταὶ ἐβούλοντο, οὐκ ἂν ἠρπάζοντο, “it is clear that they would not have been kidnapped unless they themselves wanted it.”³⁰ This pervasive but misogynistic ethos of holding victims responsible for the crimes committed against them was influential in the official view of abduction and rape throughout antiquity, particularly as evidenced in Roman law, as will be discussed further below in the context of abduction marriage. Crucially, though, it betrays the tension between the consent of the man whose daughter is abducted and the consent of the daughter who (the Persians allege) engages in sexual intercourse of her own accord against her father’s wishes. Herodotus reveals that women have access to an informal type of consent regarding their sexual behavior--even

²⁸ Fantham (1991) 270-1. Williams (2010) 103-36 presents a broad discussion of *stuprum*, but devotes little attention to rape per se.

²⁹ Harrison (1997) 197. Cohen (1993) also discusses consent as a phenomenon that was recognized in Greek culture and meaningfully applied for social purposes, although the question of consent was unrelated to any sexual act’s legality.

³⁰ Herodotus 1.4.

if the rubric by which he judges sexual behavior (such as rape) does not allow for the possibility that they withheld consent.³¹

Ovid seems particularly sensitive to the idea that women have the capacity for consent, even against the technical legal background that formally denies it to them, with the result that the concept of rape as presented in Ovid seems to come much closer to a modern sense, and there is now a large body of scholarly literature discussing rapes--as defined by the victim's violated consent, rather than legal offenses--in Ovidian literature.³² Ovid frequently relates stories of women being forced to have sex against their will. As a rule, in such stories, Ovid shows little attention to the *men* whose wives or daughters are attacked--indeed, many of these women are freebooting nymphs and evidently have no men with authority over them--the attack is not treated as a legal offense against a man with control over his wife or daughter, but rather as an offense

³¹ Herodotus here, and in other cases, presumes rape victims guilty of complicity in their rapes, as outlined by Walcott (1978) 140. It is interesting that in Herodotus, rape is generally presented as an act of war, and any personal element is downplayed as stress is laid on rape's broad societal implications (as in how Paris' rape of Helen is used as the pretext for the Trojan War). In contrast, in the works of Ovid rape is almost always a small-scale, personal violation, with few consequences beyond the victim; although the *Fasti* contains a number of war narratives, the rape narratives are entirely separated from them. Ovid generally approaches rape stories from a deeply personal perspective focused on the victim, which intensifies the significance of her consent, particularly in its absence. Cf. Evans-Grubbs (1989).

³² Johnson (1996) 16 touches on this concept in the context of Callisto's rape by Jupiter and Juno's interpretation of Callisto's guilt or innocence. The moral conflict between what men are allowed or able to do and what women want them to do is discussed briefly by Hemker (1985:46), who implicitly adopts the viewpoint that the offense against the Sabine Women themselves is of more interest to Ovid than the offense against their fathers. Richlin (1992) and Curran (1978) also discuss Ovid's rapes with an eye toward modern notions of consent; Dougherty (1998) continues this trend by drawing overt parallels between Livy's Rape of the Sabine Women and the systematic rape of Bosnian women. James (1997) discusses how the women in Ovid's contemporary audience might have reacted to the passages in which his elegiac narrator encourages the audience to coerce women into sex. Porter (1986) argues that rape is unusually prevalent and political in the modern United States and that it is too problematic to apply current ideas about rape to other cultural contexts (he focuses narrowly on early modern Britain for a contrasting culture). Unfortunately, his arguments are largely built *ex silentio* (e.g., he uses the fact that women did not voice fears about rape as evidence that they were not concerned about rape), and, as rape is a weighty and difficult subject to discuss, it is difficult to accept his conclusions.

against the woman herself.³³ Even if the physical details of the rape are related in minimal detail, Ovid lavishes effusive detail on the mental state of the victim and her unwillingness, as illustrated by the passages quoted above. I argue that, even though Ovid's society defined rape in particularly masculine terms, Ovid himself betrays a sympathy to his mythic women who are wounded and violated while isolated from others. In devoting so much attention to the unwillingness of the victim, Ovid throws down a challenge to authors who gloss over the details of a rape and allow the audience to assume--if they do not expressly suggest--that the victim failed to protest loudly or convincingly enough.³⁴

In this case, the role of men who commit rape in the *Fasti* requires more scrutiny. Although Brownmiller devotes a chapter³⁵ to the rapist as hero, Ovid does not as a rule activate a heroic reading of his rapists. Many of the rapes in the *Fasti* are actively farcical, with the joke being on the rapist: Faunus and Priapus are both ridiculed when their attempted rapes go awry.³⁶ In most other cases, the authorial sympathy seems to lie with the victim of a rape and does not exonerate its perpetrator (in the cases of, for example, Lara or Lucretia). Only in a few cases--Flora and the Sabine Women--does the author exonerate the rapist of blame, and his forgiveness is contingent upon the victim's forgiveness of the perpetrator: the Sabine Woman and Flora acquiesce to marriages to

³³ Even in Lucretia's story, the men with authority over her, her father and husband, are notorious for appearing weak and indecisive in comparison to the active, decisive Brutus. In this case, although the offended parties [for legal purposes] are visible in the narrative, their grievance is still not the central point of interest in the story: their limelight is stolen by the revolutionary who sees the rape of Lucretia as an offense against the entire Roman state.

³⁴ In Ovid's description of Lucretia, the reader observes an overwhelming societal perception in Roman antiquity that rape victims share responsibility for their rapes. Studying rape narratives in Ovid requires us to make allowance for the culpability that could be attached to rape victims, and the necessity, for example, for Lucretia to be explicitly forgiven by her husband and father--because, had they not told us otherwise, we might well assume that they see her as guilty!

³⁵ Chapter 9, "The Myth of the Heroic Rapist."

³⁶ cf. Hejduk (2011).

their rapists, and with their relationship thus legitimized, no blame falls for the original offense.³⁷ Rape, then, is not cast as a heroic act, and rapists are not heroized as such; in fact, by devoting so much sympathy to women who are raped, Ovid clearly discourages rape as a means to heroism.³⁸ Nevertheless, as evidenced by Romulus' rape of the Sabine Women, he does not rule it out.

Lara

In the story of Lara,³⁹ which Ovid claims to have heard from *antiqui senes*,⁴⁰ Jupiter calls a body of nymphs together to make an announcement: he intends to rape Juturna.⁴¹ Furthermore, he resents her proclivity to run away from him, thus demonstrating that she does not want to be raped. Consequently, he demands the nymphs help him in his endeavor by preventing her from escaping from him.⁴² Lara,⁴³ who has

³⁷ The rape of Persephone by Pluto is an unusual case insofar as so little description is devoted to either Persephone's opinion of her marriage or Pluto's act of rape; the author seems not to take a stance on whether Pluto is blameworthy or not. This aspect will be discussed more below.

³⁸ One exception to this rule in the *Fasti* is Romulus' organization of the rape of the Sabine Women, in which the narrator (Mars) unabashedly supports the mass rape, but it is justified as a necessary part of building up the Roman state (rather than an offense against an individual). See chapter two.

³⁹ *Fasti* 2.583-616.

⁴⁰ *Fasti* 2.254. The way that the *anus* who lectures on Tacita slightly earlier in the narrative, and the *senes*, are set up as competing authorities on the subject nicely dovetails with the implicit competing authorities of women who wish to escape unwanted sex versus men who would force it upon them.

⁴¹ *Fasti* 2.585-92: Jupiter, *immodico Iuturnae victus amore*, announces that *vitat...vestra soror summo iungere membra deo*. It seems logical that Ovid's Juturna is the same character as the nymph from the *Aeneid*, except for the fact that Vergil's Juturna was rewarded with divinity after being raped by Jupiter, whereas this Juturna is a nymph even before she is raped. For a summary of the possible explanations of this discrepancy, see Robinson (2011) 375. Murgatroyd (2003) has also closely, albeit briefly, examined the difference between Vergil's and Ovid's Juturna, highlighting how Ovid has stripped away the solemnity from Vergil's warrior-nymph and made the story into a comic episode, despite its discordant overtones of rape.

⁴² I find Littlewood's (2001) 922-3 reading of Jupiter's announcement as an "urbane farce" and a "witty erotic comedy" distressing, particularly because Littlewood analogizes Jupiter's unrelenting determination to have sex with Juturna against her will to Lavinia's attempt on Anna Perenna's life (as described in *Fasti* 3). The claim (Littlewood 921) that "An integral part of the charm of Ovid's *Fasti* is the way he wraps up politically correct Augustan ideology in amusing tales which offer unexpected and slightly improper

been reproved in the past for speaking too much, seeks to circumvent Jupiter's plans by warning Juturna and Juno that Jupiter has intentions upon Juturna; she is quoted saying to Juno, "*Naida Juturnam vir tuus...amat.*"⁴⁴ For this transgression, Jupiter punishes her by tearing out her tongue and condemning her to the underworld. As Mercury conducts her there, to heap injury upon injury, he rapes her, and she subsequently gives birth to twins.

The arc of Lara's story is somewhat distorted from the expected pattern of violence directly giving rise to transformation. To begin, in Lara's case she first suffers a non-sexual attack when her tongue is torn out, then she is condemned to become a chthonic goddess and relegated to the underworld, and only *then* does she suffer rape. The rape is not given as the catalyst for her transformation--the dismemberment (of having her tongue removed) is--and yet the rape is still incorporated into the story. Given that her dismemberment is presented as the catalyst, one must consider what prompted Jupiter to cut her tongue out: she reported Jupiter's sexual attacks on Juturna, in effort to prevent him from raping her.⁴⁵ A sexual offense is still included in the catalyst for Lara's transformation, but the sexual offense is not committed against Lara herself (not yet, anyway)--it was attempted on one of her friends. For this reason, Lara can be aptly compared to Arachne of the *Metamorphoses*,⁴⁶ who is punished for offending the gods, for the offense of publicizing the gods' sexual transgressions.⁴⁷ The force of both stories seems to be that what enrages the gods most heatedly is attempting to call them to

associations and conjunctions" seems to severely understate the extent of violation in Jupiter's "slightly improper" determination to rape, regardless of how "amusing" Littlewood may find it.

⁴³ She is also referred to in the text as Tacita or Lala or Dea Muta, but for the sake of simplicity I will refer to her as Lara throughout.

⁴⁴ *Fasti* 2.606.

⁴⁵ Robinson (2011) s.v. 2.607 remarks on the double standard, according to which Lara is punished for her lack of restraint (her tongue, *non usa modeste*), but Jupiter's lack of restraint (in trying to rape Juturna) goes unpunished.

⁴⁶ *Met.* 6.5-145.

⁴⁷ Raval (1998) 95-109.

account for their sexual improprieties. In the *Metamorphoses*, Philomela again provides a reflection of Lara, since Tereus seems little threatened by Philomela before and during her rape--only when she threatens to expose him is he motivated to mutilate her.⁴⁸ Some other rape victims in the *Fasti* (for example, Carna) evidently remain silent, or at least express no intention to denounce their attackers, whereas some go so far as to personally endorse the rape they suffered (for example, Flora, the Sabine Women);⁴⁹ in these cases, there is no sense that the sexual impropriety will be exposed.⁵⁰ Like Philomela and Arachne, who suffer punitive transformation into animals, Lara also suffers one of the few punitive transformations in the *Fasti*, for which reason Lara's story stands out as a case study of justice within the *Fasti*.⁵¹

The story of Lara is one that reads very differently based on whether one examines it from an ancient or modern perspective. Modern readers may be justly horrified to hear Jupiter's candid declaration of his intention to rape a woman, and equally so to see Lara punished for her attempt to prevent this rape. Of course, in the modern United States, rape is defined in terms of the victim's consent, that is, as sexual contact that is unwanted by the victim. In Ovid's world, rape was defined in terms of transgression not against the victim, but against the prerogatives of her family.⁵²

⁴⁸ Philomela is a very strong heroine here, who makes her resistance to her rapist clear, and, when she fails to fight him off, threatens to expose his crimes and bring him to justice with little concern for her own reputation. It's a pity that Ovid created this one strong heroine only to provide narrative motivation for Tereus to mutilate her, and later twist her determination for justice into murder of her young nephew and the creation of a Thyestian feast.

⁴⁹ One prominent exception is Lucretia, who makes her rape known but suffers no punitive transformation at the hands of others, unless her suicide is construed as a punishment she inflicts upon herself.

⁵⁰ It is noteworthy that Callisto attempts to hide her rape, and she is not transformed into a bear until her rape becomes physically apparent.

⁵¹ Feeney (1992) is very enlightening on how Lara's transgression and punishment reflect on Ovid's personal situation and Augustus' role in his poetry.

⁵² This idea has been examined in detail (in the context of classical Athens, which nevertheless preserves many parallels to the way rape was legally recognized and prosecuted in Rome) by Omitowoju (2002).

Moreover, Ovid's views on the use of force in an erotic relationship are far from unassailable. In the *Ars Amatoria* the narrator uses the model of Achilles and Deidamia⁵³ to endorse the opinion that a woman is expected to make a certain amount of protest to a man's sexual advances, but this resistance is only pro forma, and is not honestly felt (what a modern reader might see as a "no means yes" mentality).⁵⁴ It may be excessive to read the "no means yes" subtext of this single, relatively early narrative as representative of Ovid's consistent opinion over his entire body of work,⁵⁵ but at the very least it gives a glimpse into Ovid's blurred distinction between rape and consensual sexual relations, particularly when the woman in question is not protected by a guardian. While Ovid may build up a certain amount of sympathy for Lara and Juturna in their explicit unwillingness to be raped, he does not necessarily cast blame upon Jupiter or Mercury for raping them.

The reader recalls that Lara is a nymph; she is not described by Ovid as tied to anyone by a marriage-type arrangement, and although her father Almo appears in the narrative, he seems to exercise minimal influence over her; she cavalierly ignores his advice to hold her tongue.⁵⁶ Though Lara is described as unwilling to be raped by Mercury,⁵⁷ as essentially a free agent with no guardian to protect her,⁵⁸ she, like Juturna,

Roman rape law and its interaction with marriage is discussed in Evans-Grubbs (1989), albeit predominantly in the context of the later empire.

⁵³ AA 1.673-6, 703-4.

⁵⁴ Cf. Richlin (1992) 168-9.

⁵⁵ Hemker (1985) discusses Achilles' exemplum in connection with the preceding episode in the A.A. of the Sabine Rape and argues that the Sabines' obvious terror of being abducted in fact proves the opposite: that Ovid realizes that rape is a horrible prospect for women, something that they do not actually anticipate with joy, and that Ovid is actually mocking his own narrator (Hemker 46). In my opinion, the ease with which the Sabines are won over to support their rapists shows no substantial divergence from the model set by Deidamia, and their endorsement of their rape (as evidenced by their intervention on the battlefield) works better to support Ovid's construction of rape as a positive social force, regardless of the initial terror it might inspire.

⁵⁶ *Fasti* 2.601-2: *saepe [Larae] dixerat Almo/'nata, tene linguam': nec tamen illa tenet*. Interestingly, Robinson (2011) s.v. 2.601 remarks that Almo shares his name with the first Italian killed in the *Aeneid* (7.533-4), who was shot by an arrow that "shut off the path of his voice."

⁵⁷ *Fasti* 2.613-4: *vim parat hic, voltu pro verbis illa precatur, et frustra muto nititur ore loqui*.

does not inherently possess a right not to be raped by any man who can overpower her.⁵⁹ This background explains the strangely (from a modern perspective) non-judgmental approach that Ovid takes to the actions of Jupiter and Mercury. While Lara's patent unwillingness to be raped by Mercury excites pity, the sense of disapproval of the actions of Jupiter and Mercury is puzzlingly muted, and the equivocally laconic conclusion, in which Lara bears twins with no comment on their feelings or futures, is unsatisfying.⁶⁰ Here is a characteristic instance of Ovid's implicit sympathy toward his rape victims, which is nonetheless not brought to fruition with justice. The reader is left waiting for some vengeance on, restitution from, or apology from the rapists, but no such response ever arrives.

The rape of Lara is particularly striking when read in the context that Ovid provides for it: Lara is punished and consequently attacked for the specific reason that she attempted to prevent the rape of Juturna. Jupiter establishes in his address to the other nymphs that Juturna is unwilling to have sex with him, and that he is nevertheless determined to do so, and furthermore that he expects *their* compliance in his attacks against her, regardless of her own wishes. This proprietary attitude toward independent women may not be unjustified for the king of the gods, but is nonetheless troubling to the nymphs who find themselves ordered to betray their moral convictions, and may suspect

⁵⁸ Larson (2001) 42 addresses the sexual status of Greek nymphs, albeit briefly, in her book: "The nymph and the bacchant have in common their physical freedom, their wildness, and a certain sexual vulnerability that is associated with their 'outdoor' status."

⁵⁹ The (lack of) moral authority of Ovid's gods, especially in the *Metamorphoses*, has long been a point of interest for scholars, such as Galinsky (2005) 354-6, or Feeney's chapter on the *Metamorphoses* in *The Gods in Epic* (1991).

⁶⁰ McDonough (2004) notes the glibness of the conclusion by saying "the poet begins and ends [Lara's story] with the naive tone of a tour guide chirpily explaining some native Roman customs; what comes between is far darker in spirit" (McDonough 357) and sums up the story's ending by saying "With this hackneyed happy ending, the poet jumps indecorously from the nymph's personal anguish to the common good it produces" (McDonough 362).

that they will one day likewise be subject to Jupiter's attacks. Murgatroyd attempts to dismiss Jupiter's glib announcement of his intent to attack a woman as the "humorous" half of an episode that suddenly shifts to tragic halfway through,⁶¹ but I must question, first of all, how Ovid's female readers would have interpreted the apparently lighthearted way that Ovid presents a highly traumatic (premeditated) attack upon a woman, and secondly, how suddenly these "humorous" threats transform into violent consequences for Lara. I cannot agree with Murgatroyd that this is an example of harmless polytonality. In fact, the episode seems to provoke much larger questions about what it means to obey or disobey authority when both options have violent consequences, what happens when a powerless person attempts to finesse a dilemma and interfere with the affairs of the powerful. Simply put, there is no justice.

The way Ovid presents the presence or absence of justice in the development of this story is noteworthy. Monella states that Lara's punishment of the cutting out of her tongue and exile to the underworld is inflicted "giustamente, suggerisce il testo."⁶² True enough, despite the pitiable appearance of Lara when Mercury *vim parat*, the text makes no statement to object to Jupiter's actions, and as such Monella calls attention to "come il narratore stia dall'inizio alla fine 'dalla parte di Giove.'"⁶³ Accordingly, Lara is punished for the way she speaks out contrary to Jupiter's wishes. Although this narrative contains elements by which Lara nominally gains power, that is by giving birth to the Lares and becoming a chthonic goddess, all of the events of the story seem engineered to show other powers trumping her own: Jupiter's plans overrun her attempt to thwart them, Mercury rapes her despite her silent protest, and she is summarily banished from her

⁶¹ Murgatroyd (2005) 74-7.

⁶² Monella (2004) 58.

⁶³ Monella (2004) 58n.

home to the underworld, a *locus...silentibus aptus*.⁶⁴ Those *silentes* are not just speechless, but powerless, subject constantly to the whims of others. For one who is nominally a goddess, it hardly seems appropriate to classify Lara among the “blessed ones.”

What is even more striking about Lara’s story is that it may be the only representative in the *Fasti* of a story type that might be called the Actaeon model, one in which a mortal (with varying degrees of intention or malice) commits an offense against some god and is punished for it, whether justly or unjustly. This type of story appears with overwhelming frequency in the *Metamorphoses*: Niobe, Lycaeon, the Lycian peasants, Arachne, Erisichthon, and, of course, Actaeon (in addition to many others) are prominent examples of how the gods punish those who offend them, intentionally or not. These stories can be used to probe ideas of justice and theodicy, particularly, in the case of Actaeon, ideas of undeserved punishments suffered by those who committed offenses unintentionally.⁶⁵ Although the stories of humans offending gods are frequent and prominent in the *Metamorphoses*, they are nearly absent in the *Fasti*. It is true that the *Fasti* feature comparatively few human characters and only minimal contact between humans and deities, but even stories that feature lesser deities offending greater deities (such as that of Marsyas) are prominently missing from the *Fasti*: for the most part, the offenses run the other way, the gods attack the defenseless mortals.⁶⁶ This may be the only case in the *Fasti* that hinges on a lesser deity (the nymph Lara) offending a greater

⁶⁴ *Fasti* 2.609.

⁶⁵ Ovid evidently identified with Actaeon, as Actaeon is one of Ovid’s preferred exempla for divine injustice in the exilic works and is used as a metaphor for the (ostensibly) undeserved punishment Ovid suffers at the hands of Augustus. Consider Actaeon’s appearance at *Met.* (3.173-255), as well as *Tristia* 2.103-6. Cf. Heath (1991) 241.

⁶⁶ Cases in which gods offend other gods generally result in little consequence beyond embarrassment, if anything; cf. Priapus’ attack on Vesta, or Priapus’ attack on Lotis.

deity (Jupiter, by informing Juno of his intention to rape Juturna, and by refusing to prevent Juturna from escaping from Jupiter), and a punishment is meted out to her. While Ovid is laconic on the justice, or absence thereof, in this punishment, the reader can easily trace the narrative arc of “god creates taboo, someone transgresses it, god punishes transgressor” that runs through this story, and few others, in the *Fasti*. The lack of such object lessons elsewhere in the *Fasti* suggests that theodicy is no longer a point of interest in the *Fasti* as it is in the *Metamorphoses*: contrary to the *Metamorphoses*, in which humans frequently commit offenses and are punished for it, the gods exercise their prerogative as gods and do what they will, regardless of how it affects less powerful mortals. The reader is left with a surprisingly grim and unregulated image of the universe once justice is removed as a concern. We are left with Faunus plotting unprovoked rapes against a sleeping Omphale,⁶⁷ Numa taking Faunus and Picus captive with no negative repercussions,⁶⁸ or, in this case, Lara being banished by Jupiter for being insufficiently supportive of his attacks on other nymphs.

In a similar vein, one may see a suggestion of mortal offenses against gods in the prayer given for the Parilia:

*si sacro pavi, sedive sub arbore sacra,
 pabulaque e bustis inscia carpsit ovis;
 si nemus intravi vetitum, nostrisve fugatae
 sunt oculis nymphae semicaperque deus;
 si mea falx ramo lucum spoliavit opaco,
 unde data est aegrae fiscina frondis ovi,
 da veniam culpae.*

If I pastured my sheep on holy ground, or if I sat beneath a sacred tree, and my unknowing sheep cropped grass from a grave, or if I entered a forbidden grove, and the nymphs and the half-goat

⁶⁷ *Fasti* 2.303-58.

⁶⁸ *Fasti* 3.291-326.

god were driven away by my eyes, if my knife despoiled a grove of a dark branch, whence a basket is filled with leaves for a tired sheep, grant forgiveness for my transgression.⁶⁹

In this prayer, the narrator lists a number of offenses that he might have committed against his local deities--cutting a branch, for example, from a forbidden tree, or wandering into a forbidden grove, or allowing his sheep to feed on plants growing from a protected grave. Many of these offenses are suggestive of mortal offenses that were in fact punished in the *Metamorphoses* (the forbidden grove might be a reference to Actaeon, for example, or Erisychthon). Here, apparently, the narrator has suffered no punishment for these offenses, if he has committed them, and requests pardon if it is needed, but the apparent disjunction between the offense when committed and the punishment which has not yet arrived suggests a palpable lack of immediacy for theodicy in this work.⁷⁰ As stated above, the gods' actions, their punishments and rewards and all interactions with mortals, are dissociated from the actions of mortals; the gods do what they will regardless of mortal action.

Still requiring address is the political significance of the Lares Compitales. As Robinson states,⁷¹ the Compital cult was a significant item in the cultic renewal on which Augustus prided himself so much. The parentage of these Lares was obscure, and Ovid seems to be the only surviving author to derive them from a certain "Lara;" the handful of other references to a *Mater Larum* in, for example, the Arval Acta, give little information about who this woman is or what influence she has over any sphere.⁷² One might argue

⁶⁹ *Fasti* 4.749-55

⁷⁰ It is strange that the moral interpretation in this story is left so ambiguous, whereas the moral interpretation of such stories in the *Metamorphoses* is consistently clear and usually stated in the text: the gods heartily approve of Jupiter's punishment of Lycaon; the narrator volubly protests the punishment of Actaeon.

⁷¹ Robinson (2011) 370-4.

⁷² Robinson (2011) s.v. 2.599 connects Lara to Lasas, the Etruscan nymph who appears frequently on bronze mirrors as an ancillary goddess, perhaps similar to Iris (he notes that in the Arval hymn, the Lares are

that Ovid's (apparent) fabrication of a gruesome rape as the origin of the Lares Compitales might reflect unfavorably upon this cult renewed by Augustus, and that the violent attack against Lara that Ovid invents is meant as a political remark. On the contrary, I would argue that, even in the case of highly prominent and powerful gods, very few of their mothers retain political significance in their own right. Few would argue that Eileithyia's contrivance against Alcmena in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is a political statement, no matter how significant a figure Hercules is in the legendary history and contemporary religious life of Rome. The same goes for Leto regarding the Lycians' abuse of her in the *Metamorphoses*. While the Lares Compitales were obscure enough that they became particularly associated with Augustus, I do not take that to mean that any negative events associated with them are necessarily a comment on Augustus' religious reforms.

As a rape narrative, Lara's story bears at least one salient difference from those of other apotheosed women such as Anna Perenna or Ino: she first appears as a *nais* in a crowd of nymphs⁷³ assembled to hear an injunction from Jupiter--which is to say, she is not in origin a mortal woman.⁷⁴ For this reason, her metamorphosis from the naiad Lara

referred to as Lases). However, so little information survives on Lasa, Lara, or the Mater Larum (as known today, Lasa is little more than a name attached to a winged goddess), that making a definite connection is nearly impossible. Cf. de Grummond (2006) 29-30.

⁷³ The role of nymphs in Roman religion, and their distinction from other types of divinities, is addressed in some detail by Fantham in the first chapter of *Latin Poets and Italian Gods*. Nevertheless, I must admit a certain level of dissatisfaction with Fantham's decision to approach "truly local spirits, whom the countryman could worship in his own fields or by his spring" (Fantham 2009:4) through the works of Ovid or Vergil. Not only do I believe that country gods are far too minor and endemic to be discussed as if they were Egeria or Faunus, but moreover, Ovid is a quintessentially urban poet, and few would find in his work a rustic muse. I am not aware of a more detailed analysis of the special status of nymphs in Roman myth and religion, although Larson's book discusses at length nymphs in a Greek context.

⁷⁴ Some scholars make much of the fact that Lara and Juturna are referred to as sisters (e.g. *Fasti* 2.603), and the connections this suggests to Juturna's brother Turnus in the *Aeneid* (see e.g. Robinson (2011) s.v. 2.603, McDonough (2004) 361). I am more inclined to understand the term *soror* metaphorically, indicating an emotional connection or their common status as nymphs, rather than a blood relationship,

into the goddess Tacita is a different sort of transition, and much more vexed. Her transformation makes her into a different level of divine being, no longer a naiad, but now a chthonic goddess. Moreover, the transformation of Lara into Tacita is one that both invests her with and simultaneously divests her of power.⁷⁵ Tacita's power is illustrated by Ovid's description of the festival rite described immediately before the story of her origin,⁷⁶ in which an old woman performs a magic ritual and ends by declaring *hostiles linguas inimicaque vinximus ora*, "we have bound fast the enemy tongues and hostile mouths." Tacita, that is, has the power to silence others, particularly those who would utter curses against her worshippers, or interrupt religious rites.

Yet this would seem to be conceptually at odds with the story Ovid gives of her origin, in which she is not the one silencing, but rather the one being silenced, controlled, and abused.⁷⁷ Lara, in well-intentioned concern for her fellow-nymph, reports Jupiter's intention to rape Juturna to both Juturna and Juno.⁷⁸ As punishment, Jupiter removes her tongue, *quaque est non usa modeste*,⁷⁹ "which she had not employed properly," and orders Mercury to escort her to the underworld. As a final assault, Mercury elects to rape

since when Jupiter assembles all the nymphs for his announcement, he refers to Juturna as *vestra soror* (*Fasti* 2.592)--surely there is at least one nymph in that crowd who is not Juturna's literal, blood sister!

⁷⁵ For the disjunction between Lara's origin and function, see Monella's article (2004). McDonough (2004) 359 also comments on this disjunction, labeling Tacita "a mighty figure" as she presides over silence and remarking that "Ovid robs the goddess of the power to enforce silence, and so leaves her powerless and silent." Lara's transformation divests her of power even in the process of granting it.

⁷⁶ *Fasti* 2.571-82.

⁷⁷ Cf. Hermaphroditus in the *Met.*, who suffers an unwanted transformation, and curses the pool that caused it to likewise effeminize every man who enters that pool. (*Met.* 4.288-388). Lara's situation is more pointed, insofar as her silencing was deliberately inflicted on her as a punishment (rather than an unfortunate realization of Salmacis' innocuous (if selfish) wish), and her enforcement of silence on others is more practical than spiteful. For further on silencing and rape in the *Met.*, cf. de Luce (1993); for silence and rape in the *Fasti*, see Feeney (1992), Keegan (2002). Forbis (1997) addresses Ovid's use of silence in the *Met.*, *Tr.*, and *Pont.*, but strangely ignores the *Fasti*.

⁷⁸ There is of course a strong connection between Lara in the *Fasti* and Echo in the *Met.* (3.362-9), in the sense that both interfere in Jupiter's affairs and lose the ability to speak in consequence (cf. Robinson (2011) 375, Fantham (2009) 121). I would set Lara's story apart from Echo's as more dramatic for the reason that, although she is relegated to the underworld, she gains a sort of power, while Echo does not gain any similar power.

⁷⁹ *Fasti* 2.607.

her on the way there, and she gives birth to the Lares in consequence. In short, nothing in the story Ovid relates of her transformation to Tacita seems to invest her with power; she is given orders, and when she disobeys them, she is viciously punished (the reader never even having learned the fate of Juturna, and whether Lara's advice benefited her at all). The reader may immediately recall the story of Procne and Philomela in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.⁸⁰ There, as here, a woman is escorted somewhere by a male agent, who, in violation of his duty, elects to rape the woman in his charge, and trusts her isolation and lack of voice to conceal his crime. However, while Philomela is able to overcome her voicelessness and isolation to contact her sister and exact revenge upon Tereus, Lara's story has no such coda of vindication. Instead, Lara is permanently consigned to silence in the underworld, and bears Mercury's children without making any move to gain revenge upon her tormenters, or even shape her life in a way more to her liking. Nevertheless, she gains the power to silence others and circumvent curses, and thus wields a power over humans that she was unable to exercise as a mere nymph. While some may contend that this makes her empowered, I would argue to the contrary, for the reason that we have no indication that she ever sought to silence people during her life as a nymph. In other words, she has not been allotted the power to accomplish her goals (to prevent the rape of Juturna or her own rape), but has been granted powers largely ineffective pursuant to the goals she had. Moreover, by being sent to the underworld she has been removed from her community and denied the ability to control her own life, either by expressing opinions or by controlling decisions of when and with whom to have children. Her nominal empowerment in spite of her practical inability to direct the course

⁸⁰ *Met.* 6.424-74.

of her own life bears striking similarity to Lucretia's suicide, as I will discuss in the appendix.

The fact that Lara is empowered not in such a way to remedy the injustices she suffered, but rather to inflict the punishment she suffered upon others, may bear a conceptual link to the *Metamorphoses*. First of all, the *Metamorphoses* has long been noted for having only the loosest sense of theodicy, failing to assign the gods any sort of moral consistency or sense of ethical obligation.⁸¹ Jupiter's vindictive condemnation of Lara, and Mercury's impulsive rape, flows logically from a background in which the gods bear great power over others' lives, but are not bound by proportional responsibility to help and protect those in their care. Simply put, in a universe ruled by one absolute monarch, only the most powerful or most clever have a chance of righting any perceived wrongs committed by the monarch, and these are not, as a rule, the women whom Jupiter chooses to rape or otherwise abuse (such as Lara). Still, the fact that Lara gains the power to inflict the punishment she once suffered ties back to the way in which transformations occur in the *Metamorphoses*. In this work, transformations are not always attributed to a specific god who worked as the agent behind the change; on the contrary, most of the transformations are portrayed as occurring spontaneously, as the natural result of the person's character.⁸² The most famous example is Lycaon,⁸³ whose vicious character and violation of hospitality cause him to spontaneously change into a wolf, and even though his violation is against Jupiter and Ovid could easily name Jupiter as the agent of the change, Ovid has chosen not to name an agent. If supernatural metamorphosis is

⁸¹ Galinsky (2005) 354-6, Solodow (1998) 157-68, Wilkinson (1955) 192-3, Segal (1971) 377-8. Feeney (1991) 198-205 concludes that the gods are not amoral, but rather that they are not subject to human limitations and therefore cannot be judged on human terms, at least not as Ovid portrays them.

⁸² Solodow (1988) 168-74, Feldherr (2002) 171.

⁸³ *Met.* 1.211-43.

presented as a spontaneous exaggeration of innate qualities, Lara's own "power" of silence is augmented into the ability to silence others. and her transformation to a chthonic goddess shows that by this metric, silence is her most powerful defining quality, and when this quality is exaggerated and empowered in her graduation to divinity, her vulnerability to rape and mutilation is left unchanged.

McDonough's 2004 article speaks of Lara's rape demonstrating, particularly in its conclusion, "a jarring mixture of private misfortune with public benefit that is also at the heart of the Lucretia narrative later in the month."⁸⁴ This model also seems to apply well to Carna, who after her rape takes on a role of protecting infants in general from aggression. In this way the transformative force of the violence is generally cast as ennobling, or enriching (in the case of Lucretia), and shows Ovid's pervasive use of violence as a force for generally improving the condition of the world.

Lara's rape/transformation is also distinct from those of Persephone, Flora, and Carna because it is not suggestive of marriage. While Persephone and Carna explicitly enter marriages with their *raptors*, and Carna becomes a subordinate goddess to Janus in a way that suggests continuing consortship, Lara's exile by Jupiter and her rape by Mercury are not suggestive of a continuing relationship with either god.⁸⁵ Her implied degree of independence as a goddess is significant: for the other women in this chapter, their transformations are implied to be dependent upon their consortship with a higher-level god; the women's increased status is a sort of courtesy granted to match the status of their husbands. Tacita, having no ongoing relationship with her attackers, is an

⁸⁴ McDonough (2004) 362.

⁸⁵ Tacita and Mercury remain affiliated insofar as Tacita is a chthonic goddess and Mercury has a chthonic aspect (as psychopompus), but the relationship between the two (as represented in the *Fasti*) shows no signs of continuing.

independent power; although her status is nominally increased by means of sex, it is not maintained by means of sex.

Flora

In a certain way, Flora's story is a happier reflection of Lara's.⁸⁶ Like Lara, Flora is a nymph who undergoes a supernatural transformation that is precipitated by violence and associated with rape. In Flora's case, she is abducted⁸⁷ to be a wife for Zephyrus;⁸⁸ she is at first opposed to the marriage and tries to escape pursuit, but she changes her mind after Zephyrus compensates her:

*ver erat, errabam; Zephyrus conspexit, abibam;
insequitur, fugio: fortior ille fuit.
et dederat fratri Boreas ius omne rapinae,
ausus Erecthea praemia ferre domo.
vim tamen emendat dando mihi nomina nuptae,
inque meo non est ulla querella toro...
est mihi fecundus dotalibus hortus in agris.*

⁸⁶ Information about Flora, either as a mythological character or as a recipient of Roman cult, that can be gleaned from ancient literature is almost entirely restricted to this passage in the *Fasti* and Pliny's *NH* 18. Cf. Fantham (1993) 50-1. This fact is particularly striking in light of Vergil's omission of Flora from his list of agricultural deities at the proem of the *Georgics*, which in most other respects models Varro's from *Res Rusticae* 1.1.5-7. Ovid is definitely assigning her a prominence that was denied her by his contemporaries. See Fantham for more speculation on Flora's presumed conflict with Augustus' morality program as the reason behind her suppression. To that end, Ovid's prominent inclusion of Flora in the *Fasti* is further evidence of his independence from the Augustan program and his freedom to construct his poem to best suit his own purposes. And therefore Ovid alone is responsible for the atrocious misogynist narrative that follows.

⁸⁷ On the historical, legal, and social aspects of abduction marriage, see Evans-Grubbs (1989). It is noteworthy that, as shown by Evans-Grubbs (1989) and Dixon (2001), abduction marriage was primarily of interest to Roman legal authorities as something they were trying to prohibit the interested parties from legitimating: the girl, her father, and the abductor might have an interest in hushing up the extralegal marriage and acting as if it were legal, whereas the authorities were trying to prevent such unions from being treated as legal because they were thought to undermine the status of properly arranged marriages. In other words, even though Flora may have been willing to acquiesce to her abduction, this very acquiescence would have been attacked and rooted out as criminal by later Roman authorities. See Evans-Grubbs *passim*, and Dixon (ch. 4).

⁸⁸ As was made famous in Ovid's *Met.* 6.682-718, Zephyrus' brother Boreas also abducted his own wife, Orythia, without giving her the chance to consent.

It was spring; I was out strolling. Zephyrus saw me, I ran away; he followed, I fled, but he overpowered me. Boreas granted to his brother unchecked right to rape, since he dared to carry off prizes from the Erecthean house [i.e. Orithyia]. However, he amended this attack by giving me the title “bride,” and there is no complaint in my bed...I have a luxurious garden in fields that were a wedding gift.⁸⁹

We should note at once that Flora is one of the few rape survivors in the *Fasti*: along with the Sabine Women, she is one of the few rape victims who is allotted attention for the aftermath of her story. In this case, Flora considers herself compensated for the rape and has “no complaints in bed” once her rape has been dignified with the name marriage.⁹⁰ Flora is presented with an opulent garden⁹¹ as a wedding gift, and she is promoted from being a simple nymph into being a goddess with authority over flowers; the transformation is contingent upon violence in the form of rape, but is a positive transformation, an advancement, and comes with extensive compensation, in accordance with which, she decides to put aside any complaints.⁹²

Even more significant than the story of Flora’s rape, however, is the way in which it is communicated to the reader. Of all the rape victims in the *Fasti*, Flora is the only one

⁸⁹ *Fasti* 5.201-6, 209.

⁹⁰ Flora’s willingness to be reconciled to her rapist establishes a marked contrast to rape victims such as Lucretia, or Philomela from *Met.* 6.533-48, who speak at length on how they have been wronged and demand revenge and restitution for the offenses they suffered.

⁹¹ Flora in her garden is reminiscent of Pomona in the *Met.* (14.623-771), insofar as both are Italian agricultural deities who preside over extraordinary gardens; additionally, Flora’s rape is paralleled by Vertumnus’ determination to rape Pomona if she does not agree to have sex with him voluntarily. Gentilcore (1995) persuasively outlines Pomona’s inaccessible garden as a metaphor for her sexual unavailability (Vertumnus is able to gain sexual access to Pomona after he enters her garden under false pretenses), which sets her apart from Flora insofar as Flora’s garden is given to her after her marriage as a reward for her sexual availability to Zephyrus. Although Flora’s garden is enmeshed with her sexual availability, it represents not her chastity (as a virgin possession that she is determined to protect from male corruption) but rather her reproductive potential (as a gift granted by her husband upon the initiation of her sexual life). Furthermore, Pomona stands out in the *Met.* as being an Italian goddess in a poem that overwhelmingly stresses Greek mythology. Lindheim (2010) discusses Pomona’s garden as an illustration of stability and self-definition; Flora’s garden may likewise be a defining feature of her personality and an enclosed, protected space.

⁹² This representation of rape as the product of lust that can be usefully harnessed into a functional marriage, unrealistic as it seems in real life, well fits the model laid out by Raval of Ovid’s depiction of the rape of Persephone in Ovid’s *Met.* (Raval (1998) 71-82)--though, interestingly enough, the same model is not used in the account of the rape of Persephone in the *Fasti*. This will be discussed in more detail below.

to report her rape in the first person, giving an authoritative, cogent account of her reaction unfiltered by various intermediate reporters.⁹³ If Flora declares herself sufficiently compensated for her rape, that reaction, unrealistic though it may be, is established beyond question within the narrative. We can be certain, then, that an amicable resolution to a rape story is possible within the world of the *Fasti*, and that this is a very strong affirmation of rape myth. Or rather, we should be certain, although Murgatroyd suggests that Flora's narrative offers clues that she is not being entirely forthright with the reader: according to Murgatroyd,⁹⁴ Flora is status-conscious and sensitive about portraying herself favorably.⁹⁵ Her self-conscious affirmation that she acquiesced willingly to the marriage and holds no grudge against her husband may then be an effort to put the best face on unfortunate circumstances, as victims of abduction marriage are inclined to do.⁹⁶ The implied unreliability of this narrator suggests that Flora considers the offense much greater and less forgivable than she would have the audience believe, but, since her status is partially dependent upon her role as Zephyrus' wife, she has an interest in projecting an image of a happy marriage to strengthen her authority. It

⁹³ Newlands (2002) 206 notes the tendency of the *Fasti*'s narrator to defer to various informants to provide authoritative answers for aetiological questions, but instead of citing scholarly authorities, Ovid invents dialogues with divine authorities. This tendency, combined with the narrator's progressively declining confidence in his ability to provide accurate aetiologies (Newlands 206) may indicate Ovid's frustration at his limited access to research material while in exile.

⁹⁴ Murgatroyd (2005) 50.

⁹⁵ Barchiesi (1997) 190-1 also notes the coquettish way in which Flora hints at the lewdness of her festival, but shies away from the details. This delicate veiling of her moderate disreputability is another way in which she is cast as status-conscious and willing to bend the truth to advantage her reputation. Additionally, Miller (1983) 175, examining the *Fasti*'s conversations with gods in light of the Callimachean precedent, describes Flora as "boastful," a goddess who is conscious of others' opinions of her and consequently aggrandizes herself. Cf. Rutledge (1980a).

⁹⁶ Evans-Grubbs (1989) 61-4 specifies that victims of abduction marriage most commonly, when given the choice, agree to marry their abductors, although one of the influential factors in such a choice is often the knowledge that they are unlikely to contract a marriage elsewhere. In Roman custom women retained the right to refuse a match (a rare concession in the ancient world), on which see Treggiari (1991) 147: "In classical law the woman's consent, both to engagement and marriage, is essential." Cf. Evans-Grubbs (1989) 64; Treggiari (1982). Nevertheless, Dixon (1992) 63-4, in describing the process of betrothal, discounts the practical significance of the bride's right to refuse an unsatisfactory match.

is a Catch-22 that Flora is granted the opportunity to report the truth, but her authority to report it is contingent upon her reporting a particular version as true.

Thus this plot intersects with the idea of abduction marriage, elaborated by Judith Evans-Grubbs: Flora is a victim of abduction marriage who, like many others, agrees to marry her *raptor*.⁹⁷ In contradiction of the anxieties evidenced by the Roman lawmakers compiled by Evans-Grubbs, Flora is not complicit in her own abduction; nevertheless, she considers the abduction and rape (evident in the narrative, though referred to with a high degree of obliqueness) forgivable offenses, and, after being compensated, she undertakes an amicable marriage free of acrimony over its origin. The picture presented is one of a man who, suddenly overcome by lust, snatches away a girl of outstanding beauty and rapes her in the heat of the moment; in other words, classic rape myth. Afterward, however, his lust is transformed into genuine care for her well-being and her future, and he formally marries her and seeks her forgiveness (successfully) by means of a gift (the elaborate garden); she, seeing no reason to prolong her suffering, forgives him, and they live happily ever after. One may contrast the typical scenario set out in rhetorical *controversiae* or legislation,⁹⁸ in which a young man plots to abduct a woman against her will, and successfully carries her off with the aid of friends;⁹⁹ she is eventually reached by her family and they decide to hush up the scandal by reclaiming it as marriage. Such marriages are unlikely to be happy, and are probably not expected to be such. Flora's story, by her own account, is a sort of idealization of abduction marriage

⁹⁷ For the homosexual abduction custom practiced on Crete, see Strabo 10.4.21.

⁹⁸ Evans-Grubbs (1989) 64-70.

⁹⁹ The victim may be raped as part of this abduction, but (as Evans-Grubbs (1989) 62 illustrates) it is not necessary for her to be raped for her reputation to be ruined: the abduction forces society at large to presume that she was raped. In other words, abduction alone is provocative of outrage; the actual extent of sexual contact is socially and legally inconsequential because the victim is always presumed raped.

and rape myth, a reassurance that rape stories can end happily, particularly since the abducted woman becomes the wife of a god and is transformed into a powerful goddess.

Here again the vehicle of narration is important to the story's meaning. Flora herself narrates the story, but more importantly, she narrates it directly to Ovid. The trope of having a conversation with a god is persistent throughout the *Fasti* and is an important facet of Ovid's construction of his own authority: Ovid presents himself not only as someone who possesses much information about the gods, but as a *vates* who converses with them unmediated.¹⁰⁰ The gods who speak to him throughout the work--Janus, Mars, Venus, Juno, Juventas, and the others--generally take an indulgent, instructive view of him. He in return treats them with reverence--but not so much reverence as to prevent him from extensively questioning them on the *causae* he seeks.¹⁰¹ Flora is exalted here, not only by being put in the company of the other esteemed gods who enter conversations with Ovid's persona, but also because Flora is recognized as an authority on the topics in question. She knows the answers to cosmic questions that Ovid cannot find answers to anywhere else; of all the people in the universe, she is uniquely knowledgeable and authoritative, and this power has been invested in her *by means of her rape*.

Beyond knowledge alone, Flora demonstrates her new divine power by describing to Ovid the many humans she has transformed to flowers, and how she enabled Juno to

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Murgatroyd (2005) 30-2. Burroughs (2012) 76 asserts that "Much of the wit and fun of the poem is due to 'Ovid's' very limited success in his effort to learn from his divine interlocutors, for he repeatedly receives incomplete, discordant, or even false information."

¹⁰¹ Parker (1997) 10 addresses this rapport between Ovid's persona and the gods: "It is hard, on the other hand, to have much confidence in the Ovid of the *Fasti* since he seems confused much of the time himself...Although a teacher, he is by no means an expert, and he often portrays himself as a learner as well." In Parker's opinion, this aspect of the persona undermines his credibility as well as the ostensibly didactic program of the poem. This is most significant regarding the multiple aetiologies that Ovid provides for certain characters and customs; this idea was discussed further in chapter one regarding Anna Perenna. Cf. Boyle and Woodard's (2000) assertion that Ovid in questioning the gods is "interviewing but not evaluating" (Boyle and Woodard xlv) and that he is "presenting alternatives in the manner of antiquarians but without assessment" (Boyle and Woodard xlv).

produce a child without any male intervention:¹⁰² Flora supplied Juno with a powerful flower that impregnated Juno and allowed her to accomplish what should have been, even for a goddess, an impossibility--and she had access to and knowledge of that flower only because of her extraordinary garden.¹⁰³ She describes a period in which the Romans neglected her, in return for which she blighted their crops until the Senate instituted a festival in her honor.¹⁰⁴ Flora claims credit for not only flowers, but fruit, wine, olive oil, honey, all the alimentary necessities of the Roman world,¹⁰⁵ and she only became the goddess with this authority by being abducted and raped. The violence committed against her was her one and only means to power.

The pretense of recording a firsthand conversation with a god can cut two ways: at first blush, it invests Ovid with distinction, on the grounds that he has been specially selected by the gods to convey their words to other mere mortals. From a greater distance, however, we may discard Ovid's pretense of "gods speaking to him," and ask instead which gods Ovid chooses to speak with--or rather, which gods Ovid, in a highly artificial pretext, describes himself as speaking with for the benefit of the reader. Not only does Ovid endorse his own authority by citing the gods as his source of information, he also endorses the authority of the gods to whom he attributes his information, presenting them as trustworthy and straightforward, with a teacher-like patience for Ovid to learn all the material thoroughly.

¹⁰² *Fasti* 5.223-8 and 5.229-60, respectively.

¹⁰³ The extent of Flora's power is well articulated by Juno in her plea for her magical knowledge, in which she says *nescioquid, nymphe, posse videris*: "you seem to be able to accomplish--I don't even know what" (*Fasti* 5.246).

¹⁰⁴ *Fasti* 5.312-30.

¹⁰⁵ *Fasti* 5.261-72.

In this case, it is suggestive that, of all the raped women who appear in the *Fasti*, only Flora is shown narrating her rape to Ovid firsthand. In this way she illustrates one of the most important differences between the rapes in the *Metamorphoses* and those in the *Fasti*, namely that, as Raval outlines,¹⁰⁶ in the *Metamorphoses*, the male-focalized narrative avoids addressing rape directly, and silences by narrative means the women who attempt to report their rapes. In contrast, Flora is permitted to report her rape firsthand to the reader and in that respect betrays the *Metamorphoses*' rule. Nevertheless, Flora still narrates her rape much in the same style that the *Metamorphoses*' narrator does, to wit, she gives a minimum of detail: (*insequitur, fugio: fortior ille fuit*) and steers attention away from the actual violence.¹⁰⁷ True, she is not Philomela or Arachne, creating a graphic account of the violence imposed on the victim, but nor does the narrator attempt to circumvent her account from reaching the reader. It is telling that the only rape victims who are allowed to reach the reader are those who have endorsed and forgiven the violence perpetrated against them: their self-censorship of the violence they endured makes any authorial censorship unnecessary.

It would probably go too far to attribute a kind of Stockholm syndrome to her, merely on the grounds that she bears great affection for a man who abducted, raped, and isolated her. Regardless, in making Flora the representative voice for all the raped women

¹⁰⁶ See Raval's chapter two (1998), particularly 133-8. Cf. Tissol (2002) 313: "Readers often side with the [sic] Arachne and her irreverent depiction of divine misbehavior; yet Minerva does not ask for our approval, nor need she take much thought for the judges of the contest... Her power allows her to impose her perspective on events."

¹⁰⁷ In reality it is often difficult for rape victims to narrate the experience, not only due to shame and fear of social consequences, but also because the trauma of rape can create a memory schema that interferes with one's recall of the event, an effect of PTSD (Koss (1993) 1064). Nevertheless, the contrast between Flora and Philomela in the *Met.* (6.424-674) is instructive, since Philomela shows unyielding resistance to her attacker, and vows to make the crime public as soon as possible, and in great detail. Arethusa in the *Met.* also resists her attacker and narrates her rape in a detailed, linear narrative, so Ovid's decision to make Flora speak minimally about her rape is not necessarily an indication of Ovid's sensitivity to the psychological effects of rape on its victims.

in the *Fasti*, Ovid invests her with authority on the question of how these women have reacted to being raped, and the answer returned is: the experience is momentarily unpleasant, but ultimately forgivable. Flora is the rape victim whose perspective on rape is most closely aligned to that of the patriarchal establishment, and her perspective is likely not representative of that of the average rape victim in the *Fasti*, but nevertheless she is the one appointed to speak for them. In short, Ovid is engineering a skewed perspective of rape by inventing victims whose opinion of rape contrasts strongly to that of other rape victims, such as Lucretia, then attaching disproportionate value to their testimony.¹⁰⁸ One sees a similar effect in the *Ars Amatoria*, in which Deidamia first resists Achilles' advances, but after he rapes her, she becomes so fond of him and his sexual attention that she begs him not to leave for Troy.

*forte erat in thalamo uirgo regalis eodem;
haec illum stupro comperit esse uirum.
uiribus illa quidem uicta est (ita credere oportet),
sed uoluit uinci uiribus illa tamen.
saepe 'mane' dixit, cum iam properaret Achilles:
fortia nam posito sumpserat arma colo.
uis ubi nunc illa est? quid blanda uoce moraris
auctorem stupri, Deidamia, tui?*

There was by chance a royal maiden in the same bedroom [as Achilles, disguised as a girl on Scyria]; she learned that Achilles was a man because he raped her. She indeed was overcome by force (it was convenient to believe), but nevertheless she *wanted* to be overcome by force. Often, when Achilles was later rushing to leave, she said, "Stay!" for, with his distaff put aside, he had taken up his manly arms. Oh Deidamia, now where is that "force"? Why do you stay with a persuasive voice the perpetrator of your "rape"?¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁸ This impulse to look away from the violence of Flora's rape and instead focus attention on the story's happy ending is reflected in the cover art of Wiseman and Wiseman's 2011 Oxford World Classics translation of the *Fasti*, which shows a detail from Botticelli's *Primavera*, a close-up on Flora's beatific smiling face. The Oxford cover completely edits out the other image of Flora in the *Primavera*, in which she looks desperate and hunted as Zephyrus pursues her through the forest. For the reception of Ovid's Flora in renaissance art, see Burroughs (2012). In contrast to Botticelli's iconic depiction of Flora, in the *Fasti* she does not mention becoming pregnant by Zephyrus or having any children, but since Lara is the only rape victim in the *Fasti* who is specified to become pregnant by means of her rape, this is not a divergence from the typical depiction of rape in the *Fasti*.

¹⁰⁹ A.A. 1.697-704.

After this instructive exemplum, Ovid elaborates at some length on the inclination of women in general to give the appearance of resistance to sexual attention, to make a show of modesty that belies their actual desire to be violently attacked.¹¹⁰ The idea is persistently repeated throughout the works of Ovid that women only resist rape due to convention or lack of experience; once they are initiated into sexual experience via rape, they will grow to find it pleasurable.

As a final point, I would call attention to the aftermath of Flora's story, in which her authority over flowers is sought out by Juno to enable the birth of Mars.

*Mars quoque, si nescis, per nostras editus artes
Iuppiter hoc, ut adhuc, nesciat usque, precor.
sancta Iovem Iuno nata sine matre Minerva
officio doluit non eguisse suo.
ibat ut Oceano quereretur facta mariti;
restitit ad nostras fessa labore fores...
'quod petis, Oleniis' inquam 'mihi missus ab arvis
flos dabit: est hortis unicus ille meis.
qui dabat, "hoc" dixit "sterilem quoque tange iuvenecam,
mater erit": tetigi, nec mora, mater erat.'
protinus haerentem decerpsi pollice florem;
tangitur, et tacto concipit illa sinu.
iamque gravis Thracen et laeva Propontidos intrat,
fitque potens voti, Marsque creatus erat.*

In case you don't know, Mars was also created by my powers, although I ask that Jupiter should remain unaware of this fact, as he still is. Exalted Juno envied the fact that Minerva was born without a mother, and did not require her participation. She went as far as Ocean to decry the deeds of her husband; at last, worn out by her journey, she arrived at my doorstep... "What you seek," I said, "a flower will give, one that was sent to my from the Olenian fields. There is only one of these in my gardens. The one who gave it to me said 'Touch this to a barren heifer, and she will become a mother,' so I did so, and she was in fact a mother." Immediately I took the clinging flower with my thumb, [Juno] is touched, and she received the flower into her bosom. Already pregnant, she entered Thrace and the left shore of Propontis, and she realized her wish, and Mars was thus created.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ For other instances in which Ovid's narrator encourages the audience to rape women, see James (1997).

¹¹¹ *Fasti* 5.229-34, 251-58.

Flora willingly helps Juno become pregnant by use of a magical flower, and this pregnancy will result in the birth of Mars,¹¹² who will, as we have seen in book 3, go on to influence Roman history not only by himself raping Rhea Silvia and fathering Romulus, but also by instigating the rape of the Sabine Women. Mars, telling this story in the first person (as Flora does), describes how Romulus despaired of finding wives for the refugees on the Asylum. At last, Mars gave his own response:

*spernebant generos inopes vicinia dives,
et male credebar sanguinis auctor ego...
extremis dantur conubia gentibus: at quae
Romano vellet nubere nulla fuit.
indolui patriamque dedi tibi, Romule, mentem.
'tolle preces,' dixi 'quod petis'¹¹³ arma dabunt.'*

The wealthy locals turned away the poor [potential] sons-in-law, and I personally was considered an unworthy ancestor...Marriages were given to the most distant clans, but there was no woman who wanted to marry a Roman. I was chagrined and I suggested your father's mindset to you, Romulus. I said: "Forget persuasion; what you want, combat will provide."¹¹⁴

While perhaps not culpable, Flora is indirectly responsible for a host of rapes that would not have happened save for her aid to Juno. Ovid, through the mouth of Mars, specifies Rome's indebtedness to her as the source of their progenitor.¹¹⁵ It seems a fitting coda that the goddess who so openly endorsed her own rape goes on to effect the rapes of so

¹¹² It may be noteworthy that Mars is mentioned in connection with Thrace, which is also associated with magic in general, perhaps of the sort that allows women to conceive without impregnation by a man. One can also draw an extremely abstruse reference to Vergil *G.* 3.271-9 in which he describes the miraculous (*mirabile dictu!*, 3.275) impregnation of mares by wind, which passage includes several references to personified winds, including Zephyrus. The implication seems to be that the mares are impregnated by male personified winds rather than a non-personified force like a flower (Williams (1979) s.v. 3.275), but it may be notable that the passage compares the mares' passion to that of Leander (3.258-63), who himself lived in Thrace.

¹¹³ Note that *quod petis* is the same formulation that Flora uses above when she tells Juno how to become pregnant with Mars.

¹¹⁴ *Fasti* 3.189-90, 195-8.

¹¹⁵ Frazer (1929) s.v. 5.229 notes that only Ovid gives this story as the origin of Mars, although a similar story in some cases is told as the origin of Hephestus. In most sources Mars/Ares is simply the son of Zeus/Jupiter and Juno/Hera. It is worth noting that when this story is told as the origin of Hephestus, it is told as an unsatisfactory result (due to Hephestus' deformity) of an experimental procedure, which implies that Mars here may be just as unsatisfying as Hephestus was.

many other women--indeed, women who will, in time, endorse their own rapes as well. Flora's magical power, granted as a consequence of an act that categorically deprives the victim of power (rape), ominously hints at the deprivation of power that the Sabine Women will experience in the future.

Regarding Flora's role as a powerful goddess with the ability to work parthenogenic magic on Juno's behalf, Murgatroyd suggests that Flora is being untruthful in the interest of leaving a favorable impression on the reader by showing herself boldly defying Jupiter.¹¹⁶ Even if Flora's defiance is as courageous as she paints it, one wonders what idol she is modeling her actions on, since those who defy Jupiter do not generally fare well in the aftermath (with Lara providing an instructive example). The most famous example may be Prometheus, but within the *Fasti* we see Lara as a cautionary example of what happens to those who try to subvert Jupiter's authority. It is also difficult to argue that admiration would be popularly given to those who defied Jupiter's mortal equivalent, Augustus. It is somewhat opaque, then, how Flora's defiance of Jupiter would reflect favorably on her in the reader's eyes. Her power, such as it is, is not even something she can openly display, for which reason she asks Ovid to conceal it from Jupiter. Although she lays claim to a great deal of authority and power, it is clear that Flora has been little empowered, and greatly restricted, by her rape and consequent transformation.

Carna

Flora's story is a solid example of a pervasive tenet throughout Ovid's rape stories, namely that sexual access to a woman is always for sale, even if she says

¹¹⁶ Murgatroyd (2005) 51-2.

otherwise--one just has to find the right price, although sometimes this price must be paid belatedly. In Flora's case, she tells the reader that she accepts her garden, her status as officially married, and the authority to which she is raised as goddess of flowers as adequate compensation for the rape Zephyrus perpetrated against her. The "sex for sale" model well describes many of the stories in the *Metamorphoses*, such as that of Deiphobe (the Sibyl of Cumae),¹¹⁷ who managed to hold off Apollo from sexual access to her until he offered a sufficiently impressive gift. The "retroactive compensation for sex" model also appears a number of times, in which a rapist, in the aftermath of a rape, offers a gift to his victim, as if the crime were one half of a commercial transaction along the lines of prostitution. There is an absurd one-sidedness of this bargaining, to wit: after the crime has occurred, the victim has lost the opportunity to walk away from the transaction, negotiate the terms, or engage any of the standard commercial strategies that make bargaining meaningful. Nevertheless, this offer on the part of a rapist seems to betray a sense of ill-gotten gain on his part, or suggests that he is aware that he has committed a crime, and shows him trying to transmute this crime into a consensual transaction. The best example of this model in Ovid is Caenis,¹¹⁸ whom Poseidon rapes and subsequently offers a compensatory gift; Caenis' sense of irredeemable violation remains palpable as she demands to be changed into a man so that no one will rape her ever again.

*"magnum" Caenis ait "facit haec iniuria uotum,
tale pati iam posse nihil. da femina ne sim:
omnia praestiteris."*

¹¹⁷ *Met.* 14.130-51. It is noteworthy in the midst of this discussion of so many stories of non-consensual sex that Deiphobe is a remarkable exception, insofar as she refuses to consent to sex with Apollo, and he apparently respects her decision enough to refrain from raping her.

¹¹⁸ *Met.* 12.189-07.

Caenis says, "My suffering prompts one great wish: that I should be able to endure no such offense ever again. Let me be not a woman and you will have given me everything."¹¹⁹

In the *Fasti*, Carna's story is the most illustrative of this phenomenon. Even in the few brief lines that are devoted to her, the reader quickly learns that she has well-defined opinions about her sexual life (she is a virgin who rejects sex categorically: *nequiquam multis saepe petita procis*¹²⁰) and further that she has developed a devious, and effective, strategy to prevent others from subverting this plan:

*huic aliquis iuvenum dixisset amantia verba,
reddebat tales protinus illa sonos:
"haec loca lucis habent nimis, et cum luce pudoris:
si secreta magis ducis in antra, sequor."
credulus ante ut iit, frutices haec nacta resistit,
et latet et nullo est invenienda modo.*

Some young man would speak amorous words to her, and she would readily reply thus: "I'm ashamed to make love in such a public place: if you lead me into a more private cave, I will follow you." While the foolish man walked in front, she stopped and pushed aside some bushes, and as long as she hides, she cannot be found in any way.¹²¹

Janus is able to thwart her scheme because, with his two faces, he is able to see behind himself as well as in front, and thus notices her hiding place and freely takes advantage of her.¹²² Nevertheless, in the aftermath of the rape he seems to recognize that he has offended:

¹¹⁹ *Met.* 12.201-3.

¹²⁰ *Fasti* 6.108. Here is a recurrence of a theme from Ovid's *Met.* that Gentilcore (1995) has described: "it is often the woman's desire for a life of chastity which frequently results within in [sic] the narrative in her becoming a victim of pursuit and rape" (Gentilcore 115).

¹²¹ *Fasti* 6.113-8.

¹²² Porte (1985) 141-2 compares Carna's scheme to an episode in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* (855-955), in which Myrrhine teases Cinesias with the prospect of sexual intercourse in spite of the sex strike, only to heighten his frustration when she flees at the last minute. I however see an important difference between these two scenes: Myrrhine is exercising power over Cinesias (and, by extension, the Athenian men in general) by depriving him of sexual intercourse and calling attention to this deprivation. Carna, on the other hand, has no larger plan to manipulate the men she encounters; she merely intends to deflect unwanted advances. While Myrrhine intends Cinesias to suffer in his sexual deprivation and take a specific action in response (that is, end the war), Carna cares little what her would-be paramours do as long as they leave her alone--a sentiment with which any modern victim of street harassment may sympathize.

*“ius pro concubitu nostro tibi cardinis esto:
hoc pretium positae virginitatis habe.”*

“In return for this sexual encounter, you may have authority over hinges: take this as the payment for your put-aside (*positae*) virginity.”¹²³

There is a heavy sense of condescension in Janus’ words. First of all, he takes for granted the fact that she will accept this position as payment for his crime (unfortunately, the narrator does not relate Carna’s reaction).¹²⁴ Janus’ attitude here recalls that of Jupiter when he informs the nymphs that they are to help him rape Juturna: his sexual interest in her is presented as a blessing, and is implied to have some sort of compensation attached to it, although the advantages to the woman in question are not elaborated in his speech:

*‘invidet ipsa sibi vitatque quod expedit illi
vestra soror, summo iungere membra deo.
consulite ambobus: nam quae mea magna voluptas,
utilitas vestrae magna sororis erit.’*

Your sister sabotages herself, and she avoids what would advance her: sexual intercourse with the highest god. Advise her, for the benefit of two people, since for me it would be a great pleasure, but for your sister it would be a great advantage.¹²⁵

The reader, along with the nymphs Jupiter addresses, may justly inquire as to what advantages Juturna will gain from her prospective congress with Jupiter. Reading in conversation with the *Aeneid*, the reader will recall that Juturna was promoted from a mortal to a nymph when Jupiter deflowered her--except in this narrative, Juturna already is a nymph, so the reward awaiting her is opaque. Since the narrator’s interest turns from Juturna to Lara, the reader is never informed what the *utilitas* was, and Jupiter’s assertion that his sexual interest in Juturna is all in her best interest, even as she persistently flees him, grows uncomfortably suspect the more one searches for a guarantee. The reader may

¹²³ *Fasti* 6.127-8.

¹²⁴ True to convention, Fantham (2009) 77 describes Carna as “compensated” by Janus’ offer.

¹²⁵ *Fasti* 2.591-4.

be reminded of a similar assertion of Jupiter in the *Metamorphoses*, when he approaches Io:

*'o uirgo Ioue digna tuoque beatum
nescioquem factura toro, pete,' dixerat 'umbras
altorum nemorum' (et nemorum monstrauebat umbras)
'dum calet et medio sol est altissimus orbe.
quod si sola times latebras intrare ferarum,
praeside tuta deo nemorum secreta subibis,
nec de plebe deo, sed qui caelestia magna
sceptra manu teneo, sed qui vaga fulmina mitto.
ne fuge me!' (fugebat enim.) iam pascua Lerna
consitaque arboribus Lyrcea reliquerat arua,
cum deus inducta latas caligine terras
occultuit tenuitque fugam rapuitque pudorem.*

“O maiden, worthy of Jupiter, bound to make some [future husband] happy in your bed,” he said, “seek out the shade of the deep forest” (he indicated the shade of the forest) “when it is hot and the sun is at its height in the middle of the sky. If you are afraid to go alone into the hiding-places of wild animals, know that you go safely into the hidden places of the woods, with a god protecting you, and not a commoner-god, but the one who holds the great celestial scepter in his hand, and who sends down scattered lightning. Do not run away from me!” (For she was running away.) Already she had fled the pastures of Lerna and the Lyrcean fields set with trees, when the god enshrouded a wide space of earth with conjured darkness, and prevented her flight, and took away her modesty.¹²⁶

Io is justified in fleeing. The story is introduced by a description of her father in mourning,¹²⁷ unable to learn where his missing daughter is, so the reader is set up to expect a tragedy. True to that expectation, the reader not only sees Jupiter forcibly “prevent her flight and take away her modesty,” but immediately after, Io suffers a series of trials at the hands of Juno and Argus, first through her transformation into a cow and removal from her family, but afterward through her forced wanderings around the world and torment by a Fury.¹²⁸ Eventually she is transformed into the goddess Isis, but the reader must marvel at Jupiter’s audacity to paint her rape as advantageous to her, and to

¹²⁶ *Met.* 1.589-600.

¹²⁷ *Met.* 1.583-7.

¹²⁸ *Met.* 1.601-727.

expect her to submit willingly.¹²⁹ Likewise, Janus takes for granted the idea that his rape of Carna is in her best interest, and that she will profit from the gifts he presents to her.

Furthermore, in the course of his attempt to transform his rape of an unwilling victim into a transaction, Janus implies in the word *postitae* that Carna willingly “put aside” her virginity, when in fact her unwillingness to engage in sex was established from the outset. Unlike Apollo with Deiphobe or Poseidon with Caenis, Janus does not give Carna the opportunity to make a request; he presumptuously offers authority over hinges and expects her to accept. Moreover, the position he imposes upon her, as goddess of hinges, eternally subordinates her to him, as god of doorways. This is reminiscent of Flora’s experience, insofar as she makes no mention of being allowed to choose her compensation for her rape.¹³⁰

Other critics have read Carna’s transformation more positively. McDonough seems to endorse a reading of Janus’ pronouncement as an ennobling gift when he discusses her “dominion over thresholds and doorways,”¹³¹ and he sees important symbolism behind the assignment of hinges specifically as her area of influence: “When we take into account the erotic symbolism of the *cardo* (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.25.3-6; Prop. 1.16.26), the crude sexual connotations in Janus’ remark become clear: belatedly Janus gives her the means to guard her gateways.”¹³² In other words, authority over hinges is important to Carna because the control of access to enclosed spaces is analogous to control over her sexual life. I fear that this analogy significantly breaks down in the fact

¹²⁹ The parallel narrative of Zeus’ incessant pursuit of Io in Aeschylus’ *PV* 645-80 is even more extreme in the disjunction between the rewards that are promised to Io and the penalties she actually suffers.

¹³⁰ Flora elaborates--and likely exaggerates--the extent of her powers and the significance of flowers to the world at *Fasti* 5.261-72. Carna offers no similarly effusive speech on the glories of hinges.

¹³¹ McDonough (1997) 330.

¹³² McDonough (1997) 331. McDonough (2004) 357 also calls attention to the connection between Carna as a guardian of thresholds and the *anus* from Lara’s silencing rite, although the narrative connection between Carna and the *anus* is, for the most part, limited to the apotropaic rites over which they preside.

that not only has Carna already lost control over her interior space/sexual life to Janus, but she remains permanently subordinated to him in the dynamic of their powers. A hinge alone is of little use unless it is fixed to a door and mounted in a doorway, for which reason her power is meaningless unless operated in conjunction with his. The implication is that he retains permanent sexual access to her, and, since her attitude toward sexuality (as established at the beginning of the narrative) is that she does not wish to have sex with anyone, any control she has, as goddess of hinges, over her own sexuality is nullified by her subordination to Janus. Moreover, even before Carna encountered Janus, she had already devised a strategy for asserting her sexual desires that was effective against, apparently, everyone in the universe except Janus. The “gift” of divine authority that he grants her does not meaningfully increase her ability to pursue her sexual life as she wishes: she is still vulnerable to Janus.

Although Ovid frequently declines to pass judgment on the countless victims whose rapes he narrates, Carna is one of the few who is harshly judged by the author: when she attempts to deceive the double-faced god with her typical ploy, the author chides her for being *stulta*¹³³--possibly a harsher judgment than he gives the *creduli* whom she deceived earlier in the narrative. Thus the reader sees not only the rapist treat Carna with condescension, but even the author who created her, as the reader is invited to snicker at her ill-planned fraud. It is possible to read an even harsher judgment of Carna, that her agreement to participate in sex, however facetiously given, could be taken at face value by the swains she deceived, and in that sense she was literally “asking for it.” Her

¹³³ *Fasti* 6.123. Narcissus is chastened by the narrator with a similar pejorative while he gazes at his reflection at *Met.* 3.432: *credula, quid frustra simulacra fugacia captas?* In both cases, the narrator urges the character to recognize an erotic inevitability: Carna is warned that her rape is inevitable, whereas Narcissus is warned that his desire is unfulfillable. The narrator calls attention to the character’s foolishness, willful blindness, and inability to predict the consequences of her or his actions.

rape by Janus, then, came at her own invitation, and she is portrayed as a cheat receiving her comeuppance. Although Ovid generally shows a sympathy for the women he subjects to rape, the dishonest Carna seems to attract much more hostility from her creator for the express reason that she devised a reliable strategy to escape unwanted sexual attention unharmed and thereby deny him another rape story to tell--that is, until Janus comes along. Her clever scheme to preserve her independence, and use the power available to her (her intelligence) to control her own life, is overturned by Janus' decision to "promote" her.

Regardless, this is still a supernatural transformation narrative, and indeed one that results in a gain in universal power. Like Flora or Lara or Persephone, she is promoted from being an undistinguished nymph who conceals herself in the forests and avoids the eyes of sexual predators into a goddess with a defined province within Roman religion and prescribed worship in the same. Like Tacita, she is the guarantor of certain magical practices,¹³⁴ and also like Tacita, she gained this status as a result of violence committed against her. Her rape, then, is construed as empowering, even as Janus presumptuously imposes her power on her by means of rape.

Persephone¹³⁵

Within this dissertation I will address Persephone's rape and transformation only briefly. Certainly the narrative of her rape is a well-known story from antiquity, and much work has been done in the past on the dialogue between the various accounts of her

¹³⁴ *Fasti* 6.129-68.

¹³⁵ Ovid refers to her in the *Fasti* both as Persephone and Proserpina, but in the *Fasti* Persephone is clearly his preferred form.

rape, as depicted in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Ovid's *Fasti*, and the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, most notably the monograph of Hinds.¹³⁶ Despite the fact that Persephone's rape is possibly the most famous rape in the *Fasti*, Persephone's story has little relevance to this dissertation, for the simple reason that her story is not hers: after she makes a brief appearance at the beginning of the episode, the story turns away from Persephone's abduction, rape, marriage, and transformation, and focuses on the wanderings of Ceres.¹³⁷ In truth, Ceres is the protagonist, and the plot centers on the trials that Ceres undergoes in her search for Persephone. The very fact that Ceres' extensive suffering is caused by her ignorance of Persephone's location and status should tip off the reader that Persephone is only the MacGuffin, not the protagonist. Although I would like to discuss the violence Persephone suffers, her means of coping with her rape and marriage/imprisonment, and how this violence informs her promotion from a nymph to a goddess, Ovid has provided little material to discuss these subjects; as in the case of Juturna, there is a rape story alluded to, but the victim is hidden so well from the audience's sight that it is difficult to usefully discuss her. On the other hand, even though Persephone's violent transformation is only briefly alluded to, this passage does include another character's attempted apotheosis, that of the infant Triptolemus, whom Ceres attempts (unsuccessfully) to transform from a mortal to a god without the knowledge of his parents, whom I discussed in chapter one.

Still, this notable absence of Persephone calls attention her unmistakable presence in the parallel account in the *Metamorphoses*. In the *Metamorphoses*, as Raval well

¹³⁶ Barchiesi (1999) has also addressed the influence of the *Homeric Hymns* on Ovid.

¹³⁷ Although Ovid sums up the story as *raptus virginis edam* (*Fasti* 4.417), in fact Persephone is only a character for the first 32 lines (*Fasti* 4.419-50), in which she gathers flowers with her friends and is abducted. After that point the next 170 lines (4.451-620) are consumed with the actions of others in search of this absent character, who is mentioned at the end but never herself reappears.

delineates,¹³⁸ Ovid makes some marked changes from the account in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*: Pluto is explicitly manipulated by Venus in her scheme to rule all realms of the earth, Persephone's abduction is narrated in more detail,¹³⁹ she takes on a certain degree of complicity in her rape/marriage, and her complicity is rewarded with the power she realizes as queen of the underworld and her ability to suffer punishments upon those who insult her. The reader can recognize these elements prominently featured in the *Fasti*, for example, in the rape of Flora;¹⁴⁰ however, they have all been excised from the *Fasti*'s rape of Persephone. Ovid's decision to include these elements in the one work and yet omit them in the other reveals the artificer's hand in the narrative. The move is deliberate, and the explanation lies in Ovid's decision to turn narrative attention away from Persephone in the *Fasti* account. While Persephone may have been seen as an important independent character in the *Metamorphoses* version of the story, in the *Fasti* version she is practically an *Arlésienne* as Ovid shifts the narrative attention entirely over to Ceres and leaves Persephone silent, invisible, and utterly powerless while the story focuses on Ceres' search. Obviously the *Metamorphoses* have a much higher total of rape stories than the *Fasti* do, and by steering the reader's attention away from Persephone and towards Ceres, Ovid minimizes the role of rape in the *Fasti* still further, and shapes this narrative world into something distinct from that of the *Metamorphoses*.

¹³⁸ Raval (1998) 71-82.

¹³⁹ Likewise Jupiter's assault on Callisto is narrated in more detail in the *Met.* than in the *Fasti*, as will be discussed in chapter four.

¹⁴⁰ Pasco-Pranger (2006) 169 notes a perceived elision between the identities of Flora and Persephone in the Roman perspective, as evidenced by Pliny the Elder's misidentification of a statuary group as Ceres, Triptolemus, and Flora when Persephone is the obvious person to complete that trio (*N.H.* 36.23). For general purposes, in my opinion, this elision, on the part of Pliny or others of his day, reflects an acknowledgment of superficial similarities between Persephone and Flora (an affinity for flowers, an instance of rape reframed as marriage) while it dismisses the more substantial disjunctions between them (their status before and after the rape), particularly as depicted by Ovid.

In pursuit of the comparison between Ovid's two accounts of Persephone's rape, one should consider the internal audience. In looking at the account from the *Metamorphoses*, Andrew Zissos raises a point of interest regarding how the narrative has been altered for the particular circumstances of the *Metamorphoses*. In brief, Zissos draws attention to the fact that in the *Metamorphoses*' account of Persephone's rape, the story is being narrated by Calliope in a poetry competition in which nymphs are serving as judges; to play up for the judges, Zissos says, Calliope rewrites the story to give various nymphs leading roles, even when these roles are traditionally performed by males in parallel accounts.¹⁴¹ Zissos argues that, with Calliope as narrator, "female deities are emphasized and empowered at the expense of their male counterparts." With this change, Venus is the mastermind behind the abduction (rather than Zeus in the *h.Dem.* or Pluto in the *Fasti*) and Cyane reveals Persephone's location (rather than Helios in the *h.Dem.* or Sol in the *Fasti*).

There is an implicit idea buried in here that Zissos does not explicitly draw to the surface, to wit: female audiences enjoy seeing prominent and powerful females as leading characters in entertainment. Today this fact may not be groundbreaking per se, but it is noteworthy to claim that Ovid understands this idea, and moreover that he casually employs it for the sake of a female internal audience in a poem that is not, on the whole, overtly directed toward a feminine audience. With this in mind, it becomes even more meaningful that Persephone is an absentee character in what is ostensibly her own narrative. In neither the *Metamorphoses* nor the *Fasti* does Ovid use her as a prominent character to affect the sequence of events, and in the *Fasti* she even seems to suffer a decrease in power from what she had access to in the *Metamorphoses*. Zissos argues that

¹⁴¹ Zissos (1999).

Persephone, as a nymph herself, is being empowered and aggrandized by Calliope in the *Metamorphoses*, and to that end Calliope grants her a role of more power and influence than she gains in other accounts. She endeavors to control her fate by refusing to admit to having eaten the pomegranate, a small and negative act (and one that is ultimately foiled by Ascalaphus), but one that will nonetheless grant her meaningful control over her future. When this act is foiled, she actively takes revenge by turning Ascalaphus into an owl. In the *Fasti*, in contrast, Persephone does not even have this level of control over her future; she barely speaks and is generally shut out of the narrative. In the *Metamorphoses* Persephone may have been modeled as a powerful character, but in the context of the *Fasti* it is difficult to discuss her alongside primary characters such as Carna, Lara, and Flora.

In structural terms it is Flora's story that makes the best parallel to the *Fasti*'s rape of Persephone. Here again in the Persephone story we are reading rape myth that is romanticized and idealized. Persephone, wandering unattended in Sicily, is snatched away from her mother and taken to the underworld for sexual use. But rather than being abandoned by the god who raped her after she had served the sexual purposes of the god, she is instead legitimized as the god's wife and is forced to stay in her *raptor*'s power indefinitely. This again is an instance of abduction marriage, excused by the victim's father and legitimized by applying the name "marriage." Contrary to the approved legal model (under which abduction marriages were to be condemned, and abducted girls were required to be returned to their fathers regardless of the consequences to the girl's reputation to prevent undermining the father's authority to betroth his daughter at his own

discretion), Jupiter condones his brother's abduction of his own daughter and argues to the girl's mother that the abduction should be legitimized as marriage:

*Iuppiter hanc lenit, factumque excusat amore,
nec gener est nobis ille pudendus ait;
'non ego nobilior: posita est mihi regia caelo,
possidet alter aquas, alter inane chaos.'*

Jupiter mollifies [Ceres], and excuses the deed on the grounds of love, and he says that the bridegroom in question is not unworthy: "Even I am not more exalted: my kingdom is granted in the sky, my equal rules the waves, and another equal rules the empty abyss."¹⁴²

As in Flora's case, the reader is presented with Persephone's rape as a perilous event that is satisfactorily resolved by her marriage and her increase in status. In Persephone's case, however, the increase in status is more dubious, since it entails confinement to the underworld, which is a place where not many would choose to go voluntarily. The reader may question whether the resolution is in fact satisfactory, since (as in Cerna's case) we see only a powerful male peremptorily imposing the status change on her, without seeing whether she is happy with it.

In general, Persephone's own wishes are disregarded and not described by the narrator. Persephone's abduction marriage is frequently noted as occurring against the will of her mother, who attempts to keep Persephone in a state of girlhood, and in doing so enters a competition with Pluto for control of Persephone's sexuality. Indeed, the narrative entirely privileges the wishes of Ceres over Persephone, to the extent that the resolution of the story is framed entirely in terms of Ceres' reaction rather than Persephone's. It is Ceres, not Persephone, who complains about the marriage; Persephone's experience in and feelings about the underworld and her rape/marriage are not described. After Ceres demands Persephone returned, Mercury duly fetches her, but

¹⁴² *Fasti* 4.597-600.

when Persephone reveals that she ate the pomegranate seeds, it is *Ceres*' grief that is described:

*non secus indoluit quam si modo rapta fuisset
maesta parens, longa vixque refecta mora est.
atque ita 'nec nobis caelum est habitabile' dixit;
'Taenaria recipi me quoque valle iube.'
et factura fuit, pactus nisi Iuppiter esset
bis tribus ut caelo mensibus illa foret.
tum demum voltumque Ceres animumque recepit.*

The miserable mother wailed as if Persephone had just then been abducted, and she is hardly comforted by the long interval (since the initial abduction). Indeed she said, "Heaven is not inhabitable for me; command me also to be cast into the Taenarian pit." She was about to do it, had not Jupiter decided that Persephone would live in the heavens for six months. Then at last **Ceres** recovered her face and her composure.¹⁴³

The rape survivor has been displaced from her own story while precedence is given to the suffering or survival of those who are only secondary victims. This aspect of the rape sets it in contrast to Flora's narrative, since Flora's story is so invested in her own feelings and reactions that Flora herself is assigned to be the narrator, whereas Persephone's story is so distanced from her feelings and reactions that she is practically excised from her own story.

This systematic failure to sympathize with rape survivors and inability to imagine a survivor's life continuing after a rape suggests to the reader a hopeless impossibility to carry on with life in the wake of such violence. Here the loss of virginity or chastity or sexual reputability is equated with the loss of life (note Persephone's future as a denizen of the underworld), and implies a woman's worth can be judged in terms of a single quality.¹⁴⁴ No matter how vividly he represents the undiluted fear and unjust suffering of rape victims, Ovid never challenges the reader to imagine living through what was no

¹⁴³ *Fasti* 4.609-15.

¹⁴⁴ This idea will be discussed in more detail regarding Lucretia in the appendix.

doubt a violent and traumatic reality for many women (and some men) in his time--he only imagines the trauma of having a family member so violated. Ovid thus contributes to the already imposing challenge of surviving rape by erasing rape survivors from his texts and thus suggesting that such survival is impossible. Hinds argues that one of the significant aspects of this narrative is the transformation of *Ceres* per se, the transference of a number of noteworthy features from Persephone (in the parallel narrative in the *Metamorphoses*¹⁴⁵) to Ceres in the *Fasti*, and that consequently “Persephone and Ceres are so much in sympathy with each other that to describe the feelings of one at this moment of deliverance is also to describe the feelings of the other,”¹⁴⁶ but the *Fasti* narrative gives so little indication of Persephone’s feelings that it is only with greatest presumption that anyone can claim to equate her reaction with anyone else’s.

Conclusion

The aforementioned episodes encompass a variety of transformations: the rape victims begin as mortal women or nymphs, and they are transformed to nymphs and goddesses of various stripes. The gain in status is essential to these narratives; aside from Callisto (treated in the following chapter), none of the rape victims lose status as a consequence of rape. Callisto is transformed into a bear before her catasterism, but generally these women are promoted to a higher level of immortality, either as nymphs or goddesses. This pervasive effect applied to so many stories is bound up with two conventional ideas of rape myth. First is the idea that rape can be read as a compliment to

¹⁴⁵ *Met.* 5.361-571.

¹⁴⁶ Hinds (1987a) 94-6.

the victim (that is, the victim is so overwhelmingly attractive that the perpetrator was unable to stop himself from attacking her) and as such the rape has positive associations and is tantamount to a gain in status itself. Second is the idea that the victim can be compensated for her rape by some reward, in these cases usually an increase in divine status (although in the case of Flora, material gain as well), as if the crime can be dispelled--non-consensual sex can be transformed into consensual--by purchasing the victim's complicity retroactively. Although Ovid may demonstrate sympathy for the women he depicts as unwillingly forced into sex, the fact that his heroines are apparently willing to overlook these violations in exchange for material gain casts them as fickle. It is also noteworthy that the gain in status granted to these women is usually quite nominal: although Persephone, for example, may become the queen of the underworld, she is forced to reside in the underworld against her will, and the reader never sees her exercise any authority as queen. Her power, at least as far as is relevant to the narrative, has no practical application.

These raped women are the most prominent examples of a martyring phenomenon among the apotheoses of Ovid's *Fasti*. In the invariable incorporation of violence into the *Fasti*'s apotheosis narratives, Ovid betrays a notion that apotheosis cannot be achieved without severe trials of the person so transformed. There is a sense that these characters must earn their positions of power by means of severe suffering beforehand on earth, and furthermore that this suffering makes them more worthy of power: suffering is preparation, while divinity is compensation.¹⁴⁷ This martyring effect will also be witnessed in most of the following stories, although to different extents and

¹⁴⁷ Merli (2004) 469 alludes to this idea, when comparing the accounts of Chiron's catasterism in the *Met.* and the *Fasti*, saying that "Il saggio Centauro...diviene nel poema calendriale un genitore umano in agonia assistito e pianto dal figlioletto."

with different effects. It is something that Ovid seems to perceive as essential to the transition to divinity, although he certainly acknowledges the unpleasantness of enduring it.

There can be no question that rape is represented by Ovid in the *Fasti* as a remarkable violation, and an event that has the power to transform a person (whether supernaturally or not). Even if the violence is related in minimal detail, it is cast as an essential component of the narrative of supernatural transformation, and is equated to other violence that might catalyze supernatural transformation, such as poisoning, trampling, battery, or temporary insanity. In the *Fasti*, rape is a factor in the clear majority--but not all--of supernatural transformations when women are affected.

CHAPTER 4

CATASTERISM

Finally, I must address the numerous apotheoses in the *Fasti* that take the form of catasterism.¹ References to constellations are frequent throughout the *Fasti*, and lend an important element of chronological structure to a poem that is often read as disorganized and directionless.² While the order and pacing of the astronomical passages have in the past been analyzed as indicators of the passage of time within Ovid's chronologically organized poem, I propose to study them according to their narrative structures, the events that appear or fail to appear in each catasterism, and the causes attributed to those events.

The *Fasti* contains a number of narratives relating the origins of stars, which usually start out as mortals or animals (or even objects) on earth before they are involved in extraordinary events and translated to the sky. In the category of 'catasterism' I include

¹ Catasterism may not leap to mind as a category of apotheosis, but it deserves attention in this dissertation as a form of supernatural transformation that is frequently precipitated by violence. As will be discussed below, catasterism grants a highly variable and ambiguous status, and Ovid at times describes catasterized characters in the same terms as he does deities (the Snake-Holder, for example, is described as a *deus*; see below).

² On the catasterisms as a chronological structure for the *Fasti*, see Newlands (1995) 27-50, Fox (2004) 100-1, and Kimpton (2014), all of which are based on the work of Ideler (1825). Martin (1985) 262 notes the importance of the astronomical framework of the poem because it highlights a "contrast between the often arbitrary, obscure conceptualizations by which man orders his existence [i.e. the civic/religious calendar], and the eternal regularity of the stars." Despite the chronological structure lent to the poem by the astronomical references, Ovid's *Fasti* has been notorious for its astronomical inaccuracy, yet in Ovid's "inaccuracies" scholars often seek out intentional literary meaning, as in Gee (2002), Robinson (2007), or Newlands (1995) 46-7.

narrative accounts of one or more characters' transformation into a star, star cluster, or constellation,³ but, since this dissertation is concerned with the process of transformation, for an episode to be considered here the transformation itself must be described.⁴ All of these catasterisms are brief narratives with simple, direct story arcs,⁵ and the dearth of detail available in any given episode lends the episodes to brief treatment here. Because they are afforded so little expansion by Ovid, I will be treating them collectively, organized by their structural elements, although certain narratives with complicating factors will be given individual treatment below.

Before I delve too far into the catasterisms as apotheosis narratives, I must address the astronomical aspect of the *Fasti* more generally. Most importantly, if the *Fasti* is so called as an outgrowth of the Roman calendrical tradition,⁶ one should note that Roman calendars generally commemorate religious and civic events but omit any correlation of the civic calendar to astronomical time indications. Boyle and Woodard note that "Astronomical observations are virtually absent from Roman calendars but Ovid

³ The episodes of primary interest here are the following: the Dolphin (2.81-118); Callisto and Arctophylax (2.155-92); the Raven, the Bowl, and the Snake (2.247-66); the Fish (2.459-473); Vindemitor (3.409-14); the Crown (3.461-516); the Kite (3.796-808); the Ram (3.853-76); the Goats (5.115-28); the Hyades (5.167-82); the Centaur (5.381-414); Orion (5.495-544); the Bull/Cow (5.605-20); the Twins (5.699-720); and the Snake-Holder (6.737-62).

⁴ For this reason I omit from discussion Pegasus (3.451-8): Ovid describes Pegasus as a winged horse on earth before he was transformed to a constellation, but gives no narrative of the transformation itself. Likewise I omit the description of the Pleiades (4.169-78), in which the Pleiades are implied to already be stars, and the *aetion* explains why Merope is *not* visible. I include the Fish with reluctance; in Ovid's narrative, the Fish seem to be simply a form that Venus and Cupid assume and are not fish with a separate identity, which implies that the constellation is a *depiction* of Venus and Cupid as fish, and that Venus and Cupid are not themselves catasterized into the Fish. Nevertheless, Ovid's apostrophe to the catasterized Fish (2.459-60) and the statement that the Fish "leapt" into the sky (2.471) implies that the stellar Fish acquired an independent identity in the course of transformation, if they did not have one before.

⁵ The longest is that of the Crown, 56 lines long, thanks to Ariadne's lament.

⁶ As is affirmed by Santini (1975) 1-2. More precisely, the *Fasti* is generally read to have two primary literary models, Aratus' *Phaenomena* and Callimachus' *Aetia*, but Roman civic calendars --most notably, in surviving examples, the *Fasti Praenestini*--were a major influence as well. Cf. Kimpton (2014) 29.

makes a point of including them.”⁷ It is certainly significant that Ovid has combined the civic calendar of primarily religious festivals and commemorations with astronomical observations, incorporating the parallel (but separate) tradition of agrarian didactics: the works of Hesiod, Aratus, Vergil, Eratosthenes, Cato, Varro, Columella, and others. In pre-Ovidian times such a blend would have been dubious because, prior to the Julian calendar reforms, the Roman calendar as observed by the state was subject to arbitrary instatement of intercalary months by pontifices.⁸ The civic *fasti* were not controlled by astronomers and were not intended to harmonize with astronomical time, nor to guide farmers in their time-sensitive annual labor cycle.⁹ Other literary works did not harmonize civic time with astronomical time because there was no expectation of harmony between the two; civic time was not an observation of natural phenomena but rather an injunction to humans in what rituals they were to observe.¹⁰ Indeed, Newlands remarks on the outré composition model of Ovid’s “*fasti*” in merging the astronomical calendar into the civic one.¹¹ In Ovid’s *Fasti* the use of the risings and settings of stars as a means of tracking the dates of civic and religious events implies a reliable synchronization between the two calendars even though many have attacked Ovid for flagrant astronomical inaccuracies.¹²

⁷ Boyle and Woodard (2000) xxxvii; cf. Boyle (1997) 8-9. Santini (1975) argues the opposite, saying that astronomical notes have a proud place in the *fasti* tradition.

⁸ Hannah (2005) 106-12.

⁹ Pliny *NH* 18, a compilation of agricultural advice, probably best illustrates the anxiety that farmers may have of when to plant particular crops so they will not fail, and what natural phenomena signal the proper times. *NH* 18.224-9 gives an assortment of rules from different sources on when is the best time to plant.

¹⁰ Cf. Gee (2000) 9-15.

¹¹ Newlands (1995) 28-9.

¹² Ideler (1825) is the most influential source on this subject, although a flurry of responses have been published recently, not all of which fault Ovid’s astronomy to any great degree. See Robinson (2007), Fox (2004), Kimpton (2014), Martin (1985).

For her part, Newlands seems to treat the *Fasti* as two separate collections of stories that have been indiscriminately shuffled together.¹³ In the one collection are aetiologies of Roman festivals and customs, generally starring Roman gods or rustic Italian spirits, and featuring landmarks either within the city of Rome or at least well-known and important to Romans. These are important as a class because much of the information Ovid presents on the subject is not reported by other sources, or if so, is only reported rarely and incompletely. The other collection is aetiologies of constellations, related by Ovid as traditional stories from Greek mythology. Unlike the Roman stories, the astronomical episodes consistently have comparanda as preserved in several extant Greek sources on astronomy. These two collections serve similar purposes insofar as they both help track the annual progress of time, but there is substantial variance between those with Greek sources and those of Roman origin, as can be seen embedded in the structures of the stories. I have already discussed in the preceding chapters the construction of apotheosis stories from rustic Roman folklore, but it remains to discuss how the Greek catasterism stories are constructed, and how they frequently diverge from the narrative arc that the Roman apotheoses so often illustrate, as examined in the preceding chapters. This divergence between Greek and Roman apotheosis narratives in the *Fasti* stresses the disjunction between the civic gods and the divine figures in the stars.¹⁴

There are a number of cases in which Ovid has adopted a story out of Greek literature and assimilated it to Roman folklore. In the first chapter I discussed how this affected Ino, who came out of an established background of Greek literature in the

¹³ Newlands (1995) 27 and passim.

¹⁴ This phenomenon is partially a consequence of Ovid's integration of his literary predecessors (such as Aratus and Eratosthenes) when he discusses catasterisms.

Bacchae and the *Odyssey*, and whom Ovid attempted to harmonize into Roman religion in her role as Mater Matuta. Hippolytus is another example of this fusion of Greek literature and Roman folklore; this tragic character from Euripides' play is shoehorned into a divine salvation and translation to Italy. His ultimate fate is described in obscure terms, and one is able to imagine various possibilities of either apotheosis or death to follow his mysterious servitude to Diana in Aricia.¹⁵

*non impune pius iuuenis Troezena petebat:
 dividit obstantes pectore taurus aquas.
 solliciti terrentur equi, frustra que retenti
 per scopulos dominum duraque saxa trahant.
 exciderat curru, lorisque morantibus artus
 Hippolytus lacero corpore raptus erat,
 reddideratque animam, multum indignante Diana.
 'nulla' Coronides 'causa doloris' ait:
 'namque pio iuveni vitam sine volnere reddam,
 et cedent arti tristia fata meae.'
 gramina continuo oculis depromit eburnis:
 profuerant Glauci manibus illa prius,
 tum cum observatas augur descendit in herbas,
 usus et auxilio est anguis ab angue dato.
 pectora ter tetigit, ter verba salubria dixit:
 depositum terra sustulit ille caput.
 lucus eum nemorisque sui Dictynna recessu
 celat: Aricino Virbius ille lacu.
 at Clymenus Clotho que dolent, haec fila teneri,
 hic fieri regni iura minora sui.*

The upstanding (but not without consequence) young man was traveling to Troezen, when a bull charged through the confining waters. The startled horses recoiled such that they, unrestrained, dragged their master across boulders and jagged rocks. Hippolytus fell out of the chariot, and he was dragged with his body lacerated and the reins entangling his limbs. He died, and Diana was deeply upset. But Aesculapius said, "There is no reason for grief, for I will return this young man to life unharmed, and the exacting Fates will cede to my skill." He removed herbs assiduously from his ivory boxes (these herbs had in the past benefited the ghost of Glaucus,¹⁶ when the

¹⁵ This servitude may have been taken over by another after his death, or may have in fact been founded by Orestes and never filled by Hippolytus in the first place. See Green (2007). Ovid in *Met.* 15.527-46 relates the same episode with fuller (and slightly modified) details; in that telling, Virbius specifies that (545-6) *hoc nemus inde colo de disque minoribus unus/numine sub dominae lateo et accenseor illi.*

¹⁶ Glaucus was a child in Greek mythology who was raised from the dead by a magician named Polyidus, see Frazer s.v. 6.750. Given that Glaucus' transformation is given as a precedent for Hippolytus', is worth

magician resorted to the herbs that he had witnessed, and he made use of the aid that one snake gave to another). He touched the herbs to Hippolytus' chest three times, and three times spoke the healing words. Hippolytus in response lifted his head from its place on the ground. Diana hid him in her grove and in the haven of her wood: he is called Virbius at the Arician lake. But Pluto and Clotho resented the fact that the threads of his fate were kept from them, and that the size of their kingdom decreased.¹⁷

Hippolytus' final status is left unspecified; although it is a supernatural transformation, the reader is left uncertain whether his return to life is merely temporary or--as is implied by the final distich--permanent.¹⁸ Conversely, in the case of the catasterisms, Ovid clearly states the characters' transformations into stars. In these catasterisms, Ovid is not assimilating Greek literary figures into figures from Roman religion, but for the most part is taking the Greek stories unchanged: unlike Ino and Hippolytus, the constellations do not need to journey to Italy before they can transform, and geography is largely irrelevant to the narrative.¹⁹

In many ways these catasterisms are a subset of the variants on the Hercules model discussed in the previous chapters, set apart by means of specific criteria.²⁰ To begin, note that these stories are not all unified to the general themes of suffering, near-death, and martyrdom that are established in the other apotheosis narratives and analyzed in the previous chapters. Although some of them, particularly human or anthropomorphized characters, show the ongoing theme of apotheosis as a salvation from death predicated by divine sponsorship, in the catasterisms the subject of transformation is not necessarily placed in danger of violence, death, or (in the case of inanimate objects)

noting that Glaucus is, to all appearances, restored to ordinary mortal life and does not acquire any sort of divinity or immortality.

¹⁷ *Fasti* 6.739-58.

¹⁸ This transformation is related as part of a catasterism story, but it is that of Aesculapius, the Snake-Holder. While Aesculapius is clearly placed among the stars, Virbius' final status is much more vague. Still, his change of name implies that he has attained a new status, as in the case of Anna to Anna Perenna, Lara to Tacita, Chloris to Flora, Romulus to Quirinus, and so on.

¹⁹ In the story of the Fish Ovid specifies that the story takes place in Syria (2.463-4, 474), but the other catasterisms have no geographical setting mentioned.

²⁰ Please refer back to the elements of the Hercules-model at the beginning of chapter one.

destruction. These non-dangerous episodes, in providing exceptions to the reliable correlation between violence and supernatural transformation in the *Fasti*, disrupt the notion that promotion to divinity must necessarily be a harrowing process full of terror and physical pain. Nevertheless, there is a narrative progression over the course of the *Fasti* (elaborated below) in which the painless catasterisms are clustered toward the beginning of the work, and as the work goes on the catasterisms become more and more predictably harrowing. This progression emphasizes the fact that someone experiencing a supernatural transformation must expect the process to be painful, even if some are able to escape this misfortune. Furthermore, due to the nature of catasterism, this access to immortality, such as it is, is not equivalent to access to power. This idea reinforces the martyrizing effect mentioned in the introduction, according to which suffering is a prerequisite for access to divine power: characters such as the Dolphin, the Raven, the Kite and others have not suffered violence in the course of transformation, and as such enter a suspended divine status with no attendant power, as will be elaborated below.

Although catasterism stories in the *Fasti* can easily be identified and set aside as a category, overall the distinction between catasterism and other forms of apotheosis is not very clear in Ovid. In some cases these transformations clearly are equated to one another somehow in dignity or status; for example, when Callisto is catasterized she is referred to as a *dea*,²¹ and when Asculapius is catasterized the narrator specifies *deus est* and remarks on the unexpected honor that Jupiter has conferred upon the man he intended to punish:²²

²¹ *Met.* 2.521, but not in the *Fasti*.

²² Littlewood (2006) s.v. 6.759-60 proposes an allegorical reading of this passage, in which Jupiter represents Augustus, Aesculapius represents Ovid, and Aesculapius' initial destruction followed by greater

*Iuppiter, exemplum veritus, derexit in ipsum
fulmina qui nimiae moverat artis opem.
Phoebe, querebaris: deus est, placare parenti:
propter te, fieri quod vetat, ipse facit.*

Jupiter, afraid of the precedent [that Aesculapius had set by raising Hippolytus from the dead], cast lightning bolts at that man who had acquired the faculty of that excessive knowledge. Apollo, you complained, so he is a god to appease his parent. On account of you, Apollo, Jupiter himself did what he forbade to happen.²³

This fact prompts examination of the idiosyncratic nature of catasterism. To wit, these characters are not transformed into deities proper, but are removed to the distinct status of a constellation. They do not by any means assume the same *modus vivendi* of the Olympians, or even of the lesser divinities such as rustic gods, nymphs, satyrs, divinized heroes or personifications. Even though they are referred to as *dei* or *deae*, they do not consort with the gods as Ceres or Flora or Romulus do, but rather they become dead shadows of their former selves.²⁴ In truth, when characters suffer catasterism, they unquestionably lose their power to take action in, or even inhabit, the world that gods and mortals do: they are cast into the sky, in which they enter a sort of frozen, timeless, disembodied existence.²⁵ This status distinction is made clear in the case of Chiron, who is already immortal and uses catasterism to escape the unbearable pain of an incurable wound. Chiron suffered this wound accidentally and neither the wound nor his release

glory through apotheosis is an allusion to the conclusion of the *Met.*, in which Ovid declares his anticipated artistic immortality. Cf. Newlands (1995) 175-208.

²³ *Fasti* 6.759-62.

²⁴ In some ways, this divine equivalent of death is similar to Lara's relegation to the underworld, with the substantial difference that catasterized characters are allowed no apparent influence in the mortal world, whereas the *Dea Muta* has the ability to silence curses.

²⁵ One may suggest that, once catasterized, these figures acquire power in the realm of astrology, following the Roman belief that stars exercise power over people on earth (for an explanation of Roman beliefs on the powers of astrology, see Manilius' *Astronomica*). Even in light of such beliefs, Ovid does not depict these catasterized figures exercising any power over the world in the *Fasti*: Aesculapius, for example, is catasterized specifically to prevent him from exercising problematic powers over humans. Within this text, catasterism is presented as a means of preventing a character from experiencing mortal problems or taking action in mortal affairs.

from it are construed as a punishment. For him, catasterism is presented as the equivalent of death for an immortal who is unable to die in the conventional way. In their former lives these characters were active individuals with independent personalities who were able to exercise their wills over their environment. Once catasterized, however, these characters are deprived of active participation in life on earth; they enter a frozen state in which they can be observed by the living, but are not among the living, nor among the dead. They do obtain immortal status, and are commemorated in a highly visible way for eternity, certainly a position of great honor in Roman society. While they may nominally be granted the great honor of eternal commemoration, this honor is not realized with commensurate power to work their will in the world.

Even the honor in question is dubious. The status of being catasterized is presented in various ways depending on the surrounding story: like death itself, catasterism is cast as neither good nor bad per se, but in no way preferable to free exercise of life.²⁶ Aesculapius, in contrast to Chiron, initially suffers death as a consequence of transgressing divine law: he raises Hippolytus from the dead, and in effect steals him from Pluto; in response, Jupiter slays him with a thunderbolt.²⁷ In his case, his first death (quoted above) is punishment; this punishment, however, is later amended by “apotheosing” him, via catasterism.²⁸ Here catasterism is presented as a vast

²⁶ Contrast to Eratosthenes’ *Catasterismoi*, in which nearly every catasterism is specified to be performed by Zeus (occasionally other major gods), and nearly every catasterism is specified (or at least implied) to be an honor.

²⁷ Other variants of this story (see Gantz (1993) 91-2) show Aesculapius’ action of raising a mortal from the dead as a transgression of divine law powerful enough to destroy supposedly impassable barriers between mortality, death, and immortality: when Aesculapius attempts to raise Hippolytus from the dead, Apollo kills the immortal Cyclopes, and Zeus threatens to kill Apollo, and here, Aesculapius is raised from death to immortality. Aesculapius’ action is powerful enough to precipitate chaotic changes to universal order. Cf. Eratosthenes 6, Hyginus *Astr.* 2.14.

²⁸ The stories used as aetiologies for the Snake-Holder constellation are notoriously variable and it is difficult to unify any two narratives into a coherent whole; even Ovid’s narrative of Aesculapius’ birth

improvement over death (rather than an equivalent to it), yet it still seems to keep Aesculapius in the same state, for practical purposes: he is prevented from taking action on earth, and from repeating the deed by which he earlier transgressed. Although he was worshipped at his temple on the Tiber Island, and although he had a sanctuary at Epidaurus in which he was much venerated for intervening to save human lives, Aesculapius is presented in the *Fasti* as cut off from the living world and unable to take action in it.

Although in most of his transformations Ovid is evasive about his judgment (whether the transformation is punitive or rewarding) catasterisms in the *Fasti* are given an authorial judgment much more frequently than transformations on the whole--and the judgment of these catasterisms is highly inconsistent.²⁹ Catasterism is occasionally labeled a reward for extraordinary service (as in the case of the Dolphin or the Kite),³⁰ but at other times is cast as a punitive transformation (as in the case of the Raven, the Snake, and the Bowl).³¹ In Chiron's case catasterism is neither honor nor dishonor, neither punishment nor benediction; Chiron, already among the gods, fell victim to unendurable suffering and needed an immortal's equivalent of death. One should further ask about the consequences of apotheosis in Ovid's works, which frequently amount to little; once a character in a text has been apotheosed, he or she seldom returns to

(*Met.* 2.596-630) and the foundation of the Tiber Island temple to Aesculapius (*Met.* 15.626-744) have little connection to the *Fasti*'s description of his catasterism. Cf. Bömer (1958) s.v. 6.735, Frazer (1929) s.v. 6.735. Gantz (1993) 91-2 summarizes the literary sources on Aesculapius but says nothing of the connection to the Snake-Holder constellation.

²⁹ Rohde (1929) 25 argues (in the context of the *Metamorphoses*) that catasterism indicates a change of location more than a change of status: "plerumque igitur catasterismus non est transformatio, sed quaedam quasi migratio commutatioque loci." On the contrary, I assert that catasterism definitely represents a change of status, although the authorial judgment of the new status may vary.

³⁰ Ovid specifies that Jupiter catasterized the Dolphin on account of its *pia facta* (2.117), and that the Kite *meritis venit in astra suis* (3.808).

³¹ In their case, Apollo despises the Raven's mendacity, and, after chastising them, he changes them into *monimenta perennia* (2.265).

influence later events.³² Even though apotheosed characters may be sharing the company of gods on Olympus (or sharing the company of gods in the underworld), and catasterized characters are kept isolated from this community of immortals, neither category of new immortals has much substantive influence in their narratives. Both apotheosed and catasterized characters are quiet, demure, and non-influential.

For these reasons, catasterism is on the whole a vague and uncertain process in the *Fasti*, regarding its practical significance for those who experience it, what judgment is placed upon them and how they live in their new state.³³ Divine agents behind transformations are not always present, and when they are, their motivations for effecting transformations are at best only hinted at. It is also misleading and pernicious to try to impose the implicit ethical model on any given story, for several reasons. Take, for example, the case of Orion:

*creverat immensum: comitem sibi Delia sumpsit;
 ille deae custos, ille satelles erat.
 verba movent iras non circumspecta deorum:
 ‘quam nequeam’ dixit ‘vincere nulla fera est.’
 scorpion immisit Tellus: fuit impetus illi
 curva gemelliparae spicula ferre deae;
 obstitit Orion. Latona nitentibus astris
 addidit et ‘meriti praemia’ dixit ‘habe.’*

Orion grew up to be huge, and Diana took him as a companion; he was a bodyguard for the goddess, and her retainer. But his thoughtless words angered the gods: “There is no animal that I cannot overcome.” Earth sent the Scorpion, and the curved barb was intended to attack Latona, but Orion blocked its way. Latona placed him among the shining stars and said, “Yours is the reward for your merit.”³⁴

³² See Beek (forthcoming), in which I have discussed the uniqueness of Io/Isis’ role in the *Met.*: Isis is one of the few apotheosed characters in the *Met.* who returns to influence later events after her apotheosis is narrated.

³³ Merli (2004) 469 calls attention to the vagueness of the status of transformed characters in the *Fasti*, primarily addressing Aesculapius and Chiron (in comparison to the parallel stories in the *Met.*). Kimpton (2014) asks similar questions of astronomical notes generally in the *Fasti*, concluding that the ultimate fate of the catasterized figures is so vague as to lead to inherent confusion for those attempting to understand them, and that Ovid uses the astronomical notes to illustrate the unknowable quality of the universe.

³⁴ *Fasti* 5.537-44.

Orion boasts that he can kill any animal; his words anger the gods, so Earth sends a scorpion to kill him. Upon his death, however, Latona grants him catasterism as *meriti praemia*. In this case, the gods disagree on their judgment of Orion, and their conflicting judgments seem to render his fate simultaneously a punishment and a reward. One can try to import from other sources narrative details to explain why these things happen to Orion and what they mean to the parties in control of his fate, but that is a thorny game insofar as Orion's mythology is highly inconsistent from account to account³⁵ and one cannot refer to any account influential enough to dominate the tradition. Taken in isolation from other accounts, this narrative renders the reader uncertain of whether the catasterism, as a reward from Latona, trumps the other gods' punishment of death. If so, how does Latona maintain this hold over the other gods, and if not, why does she bestow this compensatory "reward" in the first place?

It bears emphasizing that a mortal's promotion to divinity represents an implicit improvement in his or her fate.³⁶ Apotheosed mortals attain greater power and influence than mortals do, and they live forever in the prime of life; as Ovid himself proclaims his wish to be immortal,³⁷ he assumes that his readers will recognize the implicit glory of such a fate. Further, Ovid depicts the gods deliberately abandoning earth in the

³⁵ Cf. Bömer (1958) s.v. 5.493-541, Frazer (1929) s.v. 5.537, Fontenrose (1981) chapter one, Gantz (1993) 271-3. This vexed mythology may contribute to Ovid's vague characterization of Orion; Murgatroyd (2005) describes Orion as a "minimized character" in the *Fasti*, one whose narrative significance is downplayed in deference to existing legends.

³⁶ Solodow (1988) 190-2 disagrees. Elsewhere (Beek (forthcoming)) I have refuted Solodow's assertion that metamorphosis never improves nor worsens someone's standing in the universe, but only clarifies and reveals someone's character. To take an example from the *Met.*, Io's experience of suffering in isolation as a cow and later, after her transformation to divinity, escaping this isolation and gaining the ability to aid Iphis later on, directly refutes Solodow's argument that metamorphosis to divinity does not affect a character's potential or happiness.

³⁷ *Amores* 3.15, *Met.* 15.871-9.

*Metamorphoses*³⁸ as a show of contempt toward mortals, stressing the undesirability of mortals from the divine perspective. Nevertheless, when Ovid promotes mortals to divinity he does not usually specify any virtues that the apotheosed person possessed that merited the apotheosis; as I argued at the beginning of chapter one, Ovid is no aretalogist. Mortals promoted to divinity are not necessarily better than their fellow mortals in regard to their character, but they do achieve better circumstances in the afterlife. Apotheosis in Ovid is usually accomplished at the behest of a particular god but without any enumeration of the merits of the person transformed. Nevertheless, catasterisms in the *Fasti* are to an extent set apart from this generalization, since Ovid more frequently specifies that catasterisms are rewards, and describes what merits prompt them. On the other hand, he may specify that the catasterism is a punishment. By following the catasterisms diachronically through the *Fasti*, one initially finds an ambivalence in Ovid's depictions of catasterism, since they may be cast as beneficial or harmful. This initial ambivalence, however, fades as the *Fasti* progresses, as the variation gives way to one overwhelmingly consistent image of catasterism, one that is modeled on the other apotheosis narratives in the *Fasti*.

By discussing the catasterisms as a whole, I have not attached much importance to their placement within the *Fasti*, but there is a trend that becomes clear in the course of the work. Kimpton notes a progressive aspect to Ovid's use of astronomical references, saying that "the stellar references foreground the act of observation, undertaken from a variety of perspectives, which, as the poem progresses, becomes increasingly subjective and challenging."³⁹ Likewise, I see Ovid developing his use of catasterism stories as the

³⁸ *Met.* 1.149-50.

³⁹ Kimpton (2014) 27.

year goes on, insofar as the later catasterisms tend to be described in longer narratives with more detail. More importantly, these later ones tend to follow the model used for other apotheoses in which violence and suffering precede transformation. The Centaur, Orion, the Twins, and the Snake-holder all follow this model and are clustered at the end of the *Fasti*. The earlier catasterisms, with the exception of Callisto and Vindemitor, tend to be narrated in less detail and tend to shy away from this model. When the *Fasti* opens, then, the reader sees significant variety in the quality of catasterisms, in terms of whether pride or shame is attributed to the process, but as the *Fasti* goes on, this variety of the earlier catasterisms gives way to a standard model and a standard conclusion. One may interpret this phenomenon as evidence of how Ovid revised and polished the first book of the *Fasti*, whereas the later books were hastily dashed off with insufficient editing of redundancies. Nevertheless, one must recall that the *Metamorphoses* also shows development in the use of transformation stories over the course of the work: the apotheosis stories are generally clustered near the end, allowing the stories of punitive transformation to predominate at the beginning, what Hardie describes as “the movement in the last books of the *Metamorphoses* away from a relentless catalogue of descent through metamorphosis into the bestial or worse, to a closing sequence of upward metamorphoses, as man reveals his capacity to draw close to the divine.”⁴⁰ Likewise in the *Fasti*, I am inclined to see an authorial intention, unfinished though it may be, behind the progressive restriction of outcomes of catasterism stories. The reader may hold out hope that characters can reach the stars painlessly, but this hope ever diminishes as characters more and more consistently suffer agony, mortal danger, and death itself in the course of finding immortality. While at the beginning of the work catasterism looks like a

⁴⁰ Hardie (2002) 198.

blessed exception to the rule of violence before apotheosis, as the work goes on catasterisms only serve to bludgeon that rule home. Mortals cannot reach immortality, cannot benefit from a supernatural transformation, without paying a price in suffering first.

Callisto

At this point I will move on to the characters who are described at greater length, whose stories are not so simple and direct, and, significantly, who illustrate the narrative paradigm central to this dissertation, that of violence suffered as a prerequisite to apotheosis. One example that I might set out initially is that of Vindemitor, who fits the model quite well. The boy is beloved of Bacchus, but he falls while picking grapes and dies. Bacchus, acting as divine sponsor, *amissum in astra tulit*.⁴¹ Amid the non-violent catasterisms that dominate books 2-4, this story is an early signal of the violent transformation paradigm that will dominate the catasterisms by the end of the work. The story in its brevity is an efficient distillation of this paradigm; with its minimal details and the close adherence to the model, there is little to analyze. Other stories, such as that of Callisto, demand more attention.

Callisto is difficult to categorize within this dissertation because she goes through so many various transformations: first, after her rape, she is transformed into a bear;⁴² second, when her son threatens to kill her, she is transformed from a bear into a

⁴¹ *Fasti* 3.414.

⁴² It is fascinating that Callisto is the only instance in the *Fasti* of a person transformed into an animal, given the overwhelming prevalence of such transformations in the *Metamorphoses*.

constellation/goddess;⁴³ third, her status is further modified when Juno forbids her from setting below the horizon. These multiple status changes distinguish Callisto's narrative structurally from other models that were discussed in chapter three. Her story⁴⁴ does include a transformative rape, but the transformation following the rape is punitive, and does not resemble apotheosis in any meaningful way.⁴⁵ Since Callisto's rape does not directly result in her promotion to a divinity, she does not fit the model of the rape transformations. In fact, since Callisto's transformation into a bear is one of only two punitive transformations in the *Fasti*,⁴⁶ it fits much more easily into the *Metamorphoses*. Moreover, her narrative resembles the modified Hercules-model apotheoses that are common in the *Fasti* (as discussed in chapter one), in the sense that, when she is subject to imminent danger (her son is about to attack her), the gods intervene to save her by means of apotheosis.⁴⁷ She parallels Ino in the sense that she is a victim of violence (in the form of rape and punitive transformation) who eventually is granted apotheosis, but

⁴³ Note that these first two transformations are precipitated by the same threat of "pastoral" violence that presides over the rape narratives in chapter three, as outlined by Parry (1964).

⁴⁴ The contrast, structural and tonal, between the two versions of Callisto's story in the *Met.* and the *Fasti* has been an object of academic interest going back to Heinze (1919) when these two stories were used as a primary example of the contrast between elegiac and epic technique. This discussion is primarily concerned with Callisto's representation in the *Fasti*, and only uses the *Met.* as a point of contrast, but some important contrasts do jump out. First of all, Heath (1991) has discussed the importance of Callisto's role in the *Met.* as part of a diachronic narrative on the threat of rape in isolated locations; although the *Fasti*'s use of catasterism stories starts off with a variable collection of stories that only grow more consistent in the end, Callisto's story in the *Met.* contributes to a narrative movement in which the stories begin to fit the Hercules-model more and more consistently. Moreover, many critics have discussed the individual slants of each book of the *Fasti*, and Robinson (2011) in particular has discussed the cumulative effect of pollution and purification in book 2, and Callisto's role in it.

⁴⁵ The punitive aspect is well analyzed by Johnson (1996).

⁴⁶ The other being another catasterism, that of the Raven, the Snake, and the Bowl, discussed above. Cf. the transformation of Lara (and possibly Carna), which despite representing an increase in power for the woman transformed (unlike Callisto's transformation to a bear) imply that the woman in question is being tamed, controlled, confined, and restricted under the patriarchal power structure.

⁴⁷ Johnson (1996) 17-8 justly calls attention to the fact that, while Jupiter is specified to be the agent behind Callisto's catasterism in the *Metamorphoses*, no agent is specified in the parallel account in the *Fasti*. I would follow Johnson in claiming that one can reasonably presume the agent to be Jupiter in the *Fasti* as well, but the lack of a specified agent contributes to the ambiguous appearance of catasterism in the *Fasti*. The catasterisms in all ways point to ambiguous status achieved by ambiguous means, and are difficult to classify as clearly beneficial or malignant.

whose apotheosis is delayed and does not arrive in time to prevent her from suffering violence. While Ino's narrative in the *Fasti* has been restructured from its incarnation in the *Metamorphoses*, Callisto's has largely the same structure in both works; the separation between the violence and the apotheosis was evident even in the *Metamorphoses*. Once, having been in danger of death and transformed into a constellation, she suffers a further punitive transformation when she is forbidden to sink below the horizon, further distancing her from her fellow constellations.⁴⁸ Her story is unique.

What is even more striking in this episode is the role of Arcas, who is catasterized alongside his mother, but not for the sake of saving him from an impending threat. On the contrary, he is catasterized to prevent him from posing a threat. Arcas in this way is a sort of double of Ino's son Melicertes, who is apotheosed as an adjunct to his mother. Melicertes is only a passive secondary character in a narrative in which his mother is the primary actor. Arcas, on the other hand, becomes an active force in the narrative by threatening his mother with death. It is perhaps his filial relationship to the threatened woman that prompts his subsequent catasterism, in contrast to other characters (such as the Oebalidae for the Dioscuri) who threaten mortal danger to apotheosed figures in the *Fasti*.

The ambiguous status of catasterism is emphasized by W. R. Johnson, who questions whether Callisto's catasterism is in fact preferable to the death that Arcas

⁴⁸ One may pose the question of how Juno's act of forbidding the Bear to set below the horizon constitutes a punishment; if Callisto has been relegated to a sort of divine death, she may not even be aware of her surroundings or her place in the sky. O'Bryhim (1990) has an answer, speculating that this is a punishment because Callisto is being denied the ritual purification that should have been necessary after giving birth. O'Bryhim's ideas on ritual pollution and purification are drawn from sources that vary widely in geography, time, and religion, so I am hesitant to affirm that the conclusions that O'Bryhim constructs on the basis of, among other things, Cyrene Cathartic Law, apply to Ovid's conception of pollution and purification. In any case, Juno's anger clearly shows that this edict is intended to be punitive.

proffers on his spear. When characters are catasterized, as described above, they seem to enter a sort of suspended animation, and suspending Callisto at the moment when she is paralyzed with the prospect of death may be an extraordinarily great punishment. As Johnson points out, Ovid's mortals often need death as a final release and a vehicle to closure, and denying them that may be a bitter punishment. This aspect creates further uncertainty around her catasterism, and in that way sets her apart from the other catasterisms. Whereas in most catasterisms the transformation itself draws the narrative to a neat closure that is usually implied to be desirable (and even in the case of the Raven, the Snake, and the Bowl, the punitive aspect is clear), in Callisto's case the quality of her fate is highly ambiguous.

A comparison between Callisto's narrative in the *Fasti* and in the *Metamorphoses*⁴⁹ is instructive, and reveals some of the underlying differences in narrative strategy between the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* as a whole.⁵⁰ As a primary distinction, the *Fasti* account of Callisto explicitly shows Callisto's vow of virginity, whereas in the *Metamorphoses* that promise is taken for granted. The addition of this vow to the narrative allows the reader, at least, an explanation of Diana's rejection; Callisto swore her virginity absolutely, and the violation of that vow, even involuntarily, is an offense to the goddess.

*illa, deae tangens arcus, "quos tangimus arcus,
este meae testes uirginitatis" ait.*

[Callisto] said, laying her hand on the goddess' bow, "May you be the witness of my virginity, you, the bow that I touch."⁵¹

⁴⁹ *Fasti* 2.155-92, *Met.* 2.409-531. For the pre-Ovidian legends of Callisto, see Robinson (2011) 166-8.

⁵⁰ The two accounts have been compared, e.g. by Gee (2000) 174-87; for a summary of the comparative analyses, see Robinson (2011) 163-4.

⁵¹ *Fasti* 2.157-8.

In this way, the world of the *Fasti* may be somewhat less ambiguous than that of the *Metamorphoses*, since in the *Fasti*, Callisto is punished for violating a known vow, however unwillingly she did so. In the *Metamorphoses*, where the reader witnesses no vow, Callisto seems to be punished arbitrarily for violating opaque laws of the universe that she may or may not understand. The universe of the *Fasti* is a little more comprehensible, if no more forgiving.

Another striking distinction between the episodes is where the narrative emphasis is laid. In the *Metamorphoses*, the primary emphasis is laid on the violence, the rape itself. While Ovid, as always, shies away from too much explicit sexual detail, he gives the reader ample description of Jupiter's seduction of Callisto, how he appeared in the guise of Diana, what they said to each other, how he began to force himself on her.

*protinus induitur faciem cultumque Dianae
atque ait: 'o comitum, uirgo, pars una mearum,
in quibus es uenata iugis?' de caespite uirgo
se leuat et 'salue numen, me iudice,' dixit,
'audiat ipse licet, maius Ioue.' ridet et audit
et sibi praeferri se gaudet et oscula iungit
nec moderata satis nec sic a uirgine danda.
qua uenata foret silua narrare parantem
impedit amplexu, nec se sine crimine prodit.
illa quidem contra, quantum modo femina posset
(aspiceres utinam, Saturnia: mitior esses),
illa quidem pugnat; sed quem superare puella,
quisue Iouem poterat? superum petit aethera uictor
Iuppiter; huic odio nemus est et conscia silua
unde pedem referens paene est oblita pharetram
tollere cum telis et quem suspenderat arcum.*

Right away [Jupiter] put on the appearance and attire of Diana and said, "Oh maiden, one of my companions, in what mountains were you hunting?" The maiden raised herself up off the turf and said, "Greetings, goddess, greater, in my opinion, than Jupiter--and let him hear it!" He laughed as he heard this and enjoyed hearing that he was preferred over himself, and gave kisses that were overeager, and not the sort that should be given by a virgin. When she was trying to describe in

which forest she had been hunting, he prevented her with his embrace, and revealed his offensive intentions.⁵² She indeed fought back, but only as much as a woman is able (Juno, if you had seen it, you would have been gentler), but whom is a girl able to defeat, and who is able to defeat Jupiter? Victorious Jupiter departed for the upper air, but for her the grove is a source of hatred, and the woods are accomplices. Retracing her steps, she nearly forgot to gather her quiver with its arrows, and the bow that she had laid aside.⁵³

In the *Fasti*, by contrast, the violence is elided. Immediately after Callisto makes her vow, the reader is told *foedera servasset, si non formosa fuisset:/cavit mortales, de Iove crimen habet*: “she would have kept her promise, if she had not been beautiful; she avoided mortals, but her offense came from Jupiter.”⁵⁴ In the next couplet, Callisto is already pregnant; the violence itself is never described, in contrast to how Ovid lingers over it in the *Metamorphoses*. The violence is left to the reader’s imagination, for the reader must infer that Callisto’s pregnancy, in the face of her determined devotion to virginity, can only result from an attack.

The rape of Callisto is clearly cast as an act of violence against the victim. In the *Metamorphoses* the violence is most apparent, when Callisto is depicted as fighting against Jupiter, but in the *Fasti* she is at least established to be resistant to his assault.⁵⁵ Still (as in the case of Ino or Anna Perenna), this assault does not confer an apotheosis upon her, and she languishes in the mortal world to suffer further torment. The greater violence, perhaps, done to Callisto is the punishment she suffers from Juno, her transformation into a bear. This supernatural event is a direct consequence of her rape and has devastating consequences for her, mostly remembered in the *Metamorphoses*. Not only is she isolated from her community, ostracized in a very obvious way, but she is even ostracized from the bear community, fearing to interact with wild bears who may

⁵² Or perhaps more literally, he revealed himself, that is, his identity and his genitalia.

⁵³ *Met.* 2. 425-40.

⁵⁴ *Fasti* 2.161-2.

⁵⁵ For a comparison of Ovid’s two versions of the Callisto story, see Heinze (1919).

harm her (*ursaque conspectos in montibus horruit ursos*: “she, as a bear, feared the bears that she spotted in the mountains”⁵⁶). Having lost her accustomed form and her ability to communicate (*posse loqui eripitur*: “the ability to speak was taken away”⁵⁷), she begins to lose her identity itself (*oblita quid esset*: “she forgot what she was”⁵⁸). This loss of identity is even made apparent in the *Fasti*, which is otherwise reticent on the details of her ursine life: when she finds her son, she stands frozen in place (*adstitit amens*: “she stood dumb”⁵⁹) that is, she has been so long separated from her son that she cannot act appropriately around him, and acts as if insane. Juno’s violence has not yet ended, however. Callisto is saved from being killed by her son when both of them are catasterized (in the *Metamorphoses*, specifically done by the *omnipotens*, that is Jupiter; in the *Fasti*, without an agent specified). In the *Fasti*, the only indication that this is beneficial for Callisto is that Juno rages (*saevit*⁶⁰), but in the *Metamorphoses* she elaborates on the honor that Callisto is granted at Juno’s expense:

*Intumuit Iuno postquam inter sidera paelex
fulsit, et ad canam descendit in aequora Tethyn
Oceanumque senem, quorum reverentia movit
saepe deos, causamque uiae scitantibus inquit:
“quaeritis aetheriis quare regina deorum
sedibus hic adsim? pro me tenet altera caelum.”*

Juno raged after the adulteress shone among the stars, and descended into the sea to white-haired Tethys and ancient Ocean, the reverence of whom often moves the gods, and she explained the reason for her journey to them, though they already knew: “Do you wonder why I, the queen of the gods, came down here from my celestial home? Another woman inhabits the sky in my place.”⁶¹

⁵⁶ *Met.* 2.494.

⁵⁷ *Met.* 2.483.

⁵⁸ *Met.* 2.493.

⁵⁹ *Fasti* 2.185.

⁶⁰ *Fasti* 2.191.

⁶¹ *Met.* 2.508-13.

Callisto's physical position in the sky is understood by Juno to translate to a position of real divine honor, indeed replacing (*pro me*) Juno's own position. For this reason, Juno again commits violence against Callisto; she prevents Callisto from ever resting by dipping into the waters of Ocean. Overall, the *Fasti* version sounds compressed next to the *Metamorphoses* version; many of the details are discussed only elliptically, and in particular much of the effusive description of Callisto's emotions has been omitted. This lack of detail makes it difficult for the reader to judge how the characters evaluate the events, and contributes to the ambiguous atmosphere of the episode.

The onslaught of violence, to her body, her identity, her life, and indeed her integrity as a person, is unrelenting for Callisto. These attacks generally precipitate, and in some cases constitute, Callisto's series of supernatural transformations, whether the violence is enacted against her physically by her rapist and his jealous wife, or only via threats of violence by her former community and the wild creatures to which she now seems kindred. Callisto certainly falls under the umbrella of martyr figures, for whom suffering is the price paid for the sake of divine promotion, although Callisto pays a much higher price than most.

The way that the blame for the attack is laid on Callisto, rather than Jupiter, may sound unusual in a modern context, but is characteristic of Ovid's treatment of Callisto. The reader will note that while the *crimen* comes *de Iove*, it is Callisto who in fact *habet crimen*.⁶² Moreover, the text states that Callisto *would have* kept her vow, under the right circumstances: not "if Jupiter had restrained himself," but rather "if she had not been so beautiful." The responsibility for the crime is not laid on the person who committed it,

⁶² Johnson (1996) 15 addresses this point, translating as "it is because of Jove that she suffers being slandered (that is what *crimen* means, when the accusation is, as it is here, false)."

but on the beauty that provoked it. This victim-blaming is consistent with the episode in the *Metamorphoses*, in which the narrator speaks of her in terms that clearly lay the blame at her own feet; the narrator calls her a *paelex*,⁶³ an adulteress, when she clearly was not complicit in her assault.

Callisto's rape also has implications and reflections outside the world of myth: Murgatroyd argues that, at this point in the *Fasti*, the equivalency between Jupiter and Augustus is particularly marked, and that Jupiter's sexual impropriety via the violation of Callisto is a veiled reference to Augustus' own sexual improbity.⁶⁴ In this case, the unpleasant ramifications may work both ways: not only does Jupiter's reputation for sexual unrestraint throughout the works of Ovid reflect poorly on Augustus, but Augustus, unlike Jupiter, at least operated under the pretense of monogamy and sexual continence, and Jupiter's frequent rapes of resisting women casts a shadow over his reputation. Although the *Fasti* account of Callisto's rape does not stress the brutal violation of the victim as much as the *Metamorphoses* account does, the unwelcome consequences for the victim remain prominent. The aftermath of the rape clearly illustrates that, although the rapist may walk away from a rape without a second thought, the victim will suffer great difficulty recovering and re-integrating into society. Indeed, Callisto's catasterism, though it may be regarded as an honorable promotion to divinity, seems on the contrary to have the effect of depriving Callisto of voice and power and removing her to a position in which she cannot complain of her problems. The whole process alleviates Jupiter's guilt in causing her problems by pigeonholing her in a place where her problems are no longer relevant. She is still isolated from society and unable to

⁶³ *Met.* 2.508. Juno applies the same term to Callisto (2.530), as well as *adultera* (2.471).

⁶⁴ Murgatroyd (2005) 93-4.

communicate with or relate to others, but she suffers this in the form of a *dea* rather than an *ursa*, and her advanced status prevents her problems from being viewed as such.

The last item to address regarding Callisto's catasterism is the curse that Juno appends to it, according to which Callisto will never be able to sink below the water. This aetiology to explain the fact that the bear constellations are always visible in the northern hemisphere was apparently original to Ovid⁶⁵ and deserves attention here for that reason. Ovid has taken what could have been a comforting, safe conclusion to Callisto's story and appended an explicitly negative coda, reversing the upshot of Callisto's fate (no longer a position of honor, it becomes a punishment).

*signa propinqua micant: prior est, quam dicimus Arcton,
Arctophylax formam terga sequentis habet.
saevit adhuc canamque rogat Saturnia Tethyn
Maenaliam tactis ne lavet Arcton aquis.*

The constellations shine close together: there is the first one, which we call the Bear, and the Bear-Guardian has the appearance of one pursuing it from behind. Juno still raged, and she asked frothy Tethys that she never bathe the Maenalian girl [Callisto] by letting her touch her waters.⁶⁶

The description of the punishment is even more explicitly negative in the *Metamorphoses*:

*Intumuit Iuno postquam inter sidera paelex
fulsit, et ad canam descendit in aequora Tethyn...
'quaeritis aetheriis quare regina deorum
sedibus hic adsim? pro me tenet altera caelum.
mentior, obscurum nisi nox cum fecerit orbem,
nuper honoratas summo, mea uulnera, caelo
videritis stellas illic...
†est uero quisquam† Iunonem laedere nolit
offensamque tremat, quae prosum sola nocendo?...
esse hominem uetui: facta est dea. sic ego poenas
sontibus impono, sic est mea magna potestas.
vindictet antiquam faciem uultusque ferinos*

⁶⁵ O'Bryhim (1990). Gantz (1993) 726 notes the fact that Callisto's exile from the sea is "a detail not found in any of the sources drawn from Eratosthenes."

⁶⁶ *Fasti* 2.189-92.

*detrahat, Argolica quod in ante Phoronide fecit.
 cur non et pulsa ducit Iunone meoque
 conlocat in thalamo socerumque Lycaona sumit?
 at uos si laesae tangit contemptus alumnae,
 gurgite caeruleo septem prohibite Triones
 sideraque in caelum stupri mercede recepta
 pellite, ne puro tingatur in aequore paelex. '*

When the adulteress shone among the stars, Juno raged, and she went down to frothy Tethys in the sea... "You ask why I, the queen of the gods, have come down here from my ethereal home? Because another woman has my place in the sky. Unless I am mistaken, when night will have darkened the earth, you will see my grievance, the stars honored there at the highest point of the sky... Is there truly someone who fears to harm Juno, or who cowers from her after she has been wronged, when harming me, and only me, benefits others? I forbade her to be a person, and she was made a goddess! This is how I impose penalties on the guilty, this is my fearsome power. She regains her former appearance and sheds her beastly one, just as Argive Io did. Why doesn't he throw me out, set her up in my bedroom, and make Lycaon his father-in-law? But you, if you feel contempt on behalf of your foster-daughter, deny the Seven Oxen [Ursa Major] to enter your blue waters, and fend off into the sky those stars that gain the wages of transgression, so that the adulteress will not be dipped in the pure water."⁶⁷

It is not entirely clear in Ovid's work why being denied the ability to set would have been a punishment, but for the purpose of this dissertation it is only necessary to note that Ovid clearly identifies it as a punishment that Juno has imposed upon Callisto. As in the case of Orion, Callisto has multiple divine forces competing to control her fate. Juno resents Callisto's position as a constellation, implying that this is a favorable or honorable status for Callisto to have, so Juno sours this honor to transform it into a punishment, and Callisto is left with neither power nor position to comfort herself.

The Final Catasterisms: Lead-up to the End

Here we turn to the final catasterisms in the *Fasti*,⁶⁸ which begin to be described in more detail and to take on a consistent narrative arc that resembles the Hercules model.

⁶⁷ *Met.* 2.508-9, 512-6, 518-9, 521-30.

⁶⁸ The Centaur (5.381-414); Orion (5.495-544); the Bull/Cow (5.605-20); the Twins (5.699-720); and the Snake-Holder (6.737-62).

We can start with Chiron, whose catasterism recalls Remus' death, which is deeply bemoaned as an unfortunate accident.⁶⁹ As narrated, Chiron's catasterism is one of the more directionless supernatural transformations within the *Fasti*: its cause is depicted as accidental. Unlike in many cases, the reader hears of no master plan governing Chiron's transformation,⁷⁰ and no authorial judgment of reward or punishment is attached to it; rather, he suffers an unfortunately fatal wound when one of Hercules' poisoned arrows is dropped on his foot.⁷¹

*respicit interea clavam spoliumque leonis,
 'vir' que ait 'his armis, armaque digna viro!'...
 dumque senex tractat squalentia tela venenis
 excidit et laevo fixa sagitta pede est.
 ingemuit Chiron, traxitque e corpore ferrum.*

Meanwhile Chiron examined the club and the pelt of the lion, and he said, "You are a man in this armor, and your armor is worthy of a man!"...But while the old man was examining the arrows smeared with venom, one of them fell and pierced his left foot. Chiron groaned, and removed the weapon from his body.⁷²

Moreover, the reader sees no substantial results from Chiron's transformation. The story ends with Chiron's being released from suffering by means of catasterism. Like the other catasterized figures in the *Fasti*, Chiron is removed from the mortal world and given no narrative opportunity to undertake action as a divine figure after his catasterism. In this way, Chiron illustrates how catasterized "deities" are excluded from the ordinary world: after his catasterism, he stops interacting with the world altogether, and never exercises

⁶⁹ One may compare the importance of mourning in the *Fasti* when Chiron and Remus suffer fatal injuries. Merli (2004) 464 calls attention to this aspect of Chiron's story, particularly in contrast to the parallel narrative in the *Metamorphoses*, in which the mourning aspect is heavily downplayed, saying (after Heinze (1919)) that elegiacs, in contrast to epic, "pone più volte l'accento sul carattere sentimentale, di lamento e di affetti familiari tipico dell'elegia."

⁷⁰ Brookes (1994) 446 claims that Chiron's characterization as wise and peaceful justifies his "elevation to the sky" although this fact is not specified in the text.

⁷¹ Boyd (2001) 67 in fact sees an overall comic effect from wordplay as "Ovid's narrative intentionally subverts the superficial solemnity of the story told."

⁷² *Fasti* 5.393-4, 396-9.

his divinity in the interest of effecting his will on earth, as conventional deities are wont to do. It is remarkable in this light that Chiron was immortal to begin with:⁷³ the conundrum suffered from the Hydra's poison was that it caused him an agonizing wound, but his innate immortality prevented him from dying of it. Unable to succumb to death, Chiron is catasterized, which is depicted as the equivalent of death for those who cannot die, in the sense that it removes them from the world and prevents them from communicating with the living or exercising their power.

*virus edax superabat opem, penitusque recepta
ossibus et toto corpore pestis erat:
sanguine Centauri Lernaee sanguis echidnae
mixtus ad auxilium tempora nulla dabat...
nona dies aderat, cum tu, iustissime Chiron,
bis septem stellis corpora cinctus eras.*

The consuming poison defeated any treatment, and the infection spread through his bones and his entire body. The blood of the Lernaean hydra, mixed with the blood of the Centaur, left no time for treatment...On the ninth day, you, most just Chiron, had your body encircled with fourteen stars.⁷⁴

Although nominally granted honor, Chiron is unequivocally deprived of power.⁷⁵ He cannot communicate his desires to those in the world, nor does he take action or exercise his power in the world--indeed, there is little indication that he has any worldly power at all. Like the dead, he is not observed to take any interest in the world of the living, and may not even be aware of this world. He stands apart from the preceding catasterisms because his is one of the few catasterisms that can be defined with certainty as a non-promotion: Chiron was immortal and active on earth, and there is no possibility that this quasi-death is investing him with greater potential and power than his original status did.

⁷³ But cf. Boyd (2001)'s comments on the epithet *semivir*.

⁷⁴ *Fasti* 5.403-6, 413-4.

⁷⁵ It is disappointingly ironic that, as Boyd (2001) 77 points out, Chiron loses his heroic qualities (his *vir*-hood) through his own incompetence in mishandling the *arma...digna viro* (5.394)

Ovid does not say so, but the catasterism is imposed upon him to put him out of his misery; we understand that it is the only way for him to escape his agony. He may be catasterized, but he is clearly one of the most detached immortals in the universe.

Chiron also deserves attention for his significance to the diachronic progression of the *Fasti*. His apotheosis marks the beginning of the end of the *Fasti*'s catasterisms, and all subsequent catasterisms will resemble the Hercules model, in which immortality is interposed in a crisis to save someone from death. Although the earlier narratives presented various possibilities for the course of events that might lead up to, and the status that might follow, a catasterism, that potential for variety steadily diminishes over the course of books five and six. The force of the narrative grows more pessimistic as the work progresses; while the Dolphin, that lucky first catasterism in the *Fasti*, might have had a breathtaking adventure in which it saved a hero from pirates and was rewarded for its *pia facta*, the narrative loses sight of that fanciful possibility and presents the reader with the conclusion that there is no way to immortality without suffering.

What is further noteworthy about Chiron's transformation, though, is the way in which Chiron is accidentally wounded and appears to be on the brink of death, at which point this turn of events is bemoaned as a tragedy by his loved ones--presenting a strong comparison to the story of Remus' death in the presence of Romulus, less than 100 lines later.

*stabat, ut ante patrem, lacrimis perfusus Achilles:
sic flendus Peleus, si moreretur, erat.
saepe manus aegras manibus fingebat amicis:
morum, quos fecit, praemia doctor habet.
oscula saepe dedit, dixit quoque saepe iacenti
'vive, precor, nec me, care, relinque, pater.'*

Achilles was standing as if he were before his father, soaked with tears. If Peleus were to die, he would have had to be mourned just so. Often he was handling Chiron's weak hands with his own hands; the teacher had the benefit of the instruction he had given his pupil. Often Achilles kissed him, and often said to the one lying before him, "Please live, father, and do not abandon me."⁷⁶

The most substantial difference between these episodes is that Chiron's death is miraculously averted by catasterism, while Remus' death is allowed to continue uninterrupted. Once again, Remus suffers in comparison to his brother by being trapped in conventional mortal reality, never escaping into the supernatural as so many other characters in the *Fasti* (such as Romulus, and here Chiron) are able to do.

Moving on, I would call attention to the apotheosis of Castor and Pollux at the conclusion of book 5, who make a striking contrast to Romulus and Remus.⁷⁷ The half-apotheosis accorded to this pair of brothers--in which the two share one immortality that was promised only to the brother fathered by Zeus, Pollux--is certainly an anomaly in the realm of mythic apotheoses: the brothers spend eternity traveling between Hades and Olympus on alternating days, while more commonly a hero spends eternity in one location or the other.⁷⁸ As I discussed in chapter two, Romulus and Remus share one apotheosis process in the sense that Romulus gains the prize of immortality after Remus suffers the requisite violence. The afterlife is their point of divergence, and the two will never interact again after they separate on earth. Conversely, Castor and Pollux are able

⁷⁶ *Fasti* 5.407-12.

⁷⁷ Although most of the characters discussed in this dissertation are presented in the *Fasti* as divine, many of them are extremely minor divinities and are not associated with any widespread cult, and my discussion in this dissertation addresses them as characters in myth. The Dioscuri, on the other hand, were recipients of a well known hero cult and were worshipped at many sites in both Greece and Italy. For the Greek hero cult of the Dioscuri, see Shapiro (1999), Farnell (1921) chapter eight ("The Dioskouroi"). For their religious significance in the Roman state, see below.

⁷⁸ Although the Dioscuri are commonly understood to share Pollux' immortality, the details of this arrangement (e.g., whether they spend their time in Olympus and Hades together or separated) are not clearly elucidated by ancient authors (Gantz (1993) 327-8), and Ovid seems to be alone in narrating their catasterism.

to share the apotheosis itself and both gain access to Olympus--but only for half of eternity.

Ovid's depiction of the twins' apotheosis appears to be an uncomplicated illustration of the model already laid out for Chiron. The twins engage the Oebalidae in a combat, and Castor suffers a grievous wound. A victim of violence, Castor is on the brink of death, and his death is averted by a supernatural transformation.

*pectora traiectus Lynceo Castor ab ense
non expectato volnere pressit humum; ...
iamque tibi, Pollux, caelum sublime patebat,
cum 'mea' dixisti 'percipe verba, pater:
quod mihi das uni caelum, partire duobus;
dimidium toto munere maius erit.'
dixit et alterna fratrem statione redemit:
utile sollicitae sidus utrumque rati.*

Castor, having been impaled in the chest by the sword of Lynceus, collapsed to the ground on account of his unexpected wound. For you, Pollux, the sky above was already available, but you said, "Listen to my words, father: since you promised heaven to me alone, split it between the two of us; half the gift will be greater than the whole." He said this, and redeemed his brother with alternating status, and either Twin [as Gemini] is helpful to a troubled ship.⁷⁹

It is significant that the violence that precipitates Castor's death is much less accidental than Chiron's; indeed, Castor himself instigated it by initiating the attack against the daughters of Leucippus and prompting Leucippus to defend his daughters. This programmatic violence, first the Dioscuri's attack against the Leucippides, then the retaliatory attack against the Dioscuri, is undertaken for a specified reason, even if a somewhat impulsive and ill-calculated reason (on the part of the Dioscuri)--much as the rape of Rhea Silvia by Mars. Although the violence lacks divine intention behind the deadly attack (such as one sees in the case of Orion or Aesculapius), it still stands in sharp contrast to the chance clumsiness of Chiron, who happens to drop an arrow on his

⁷⁹ *Fasti* 5.709-10, 715-20.

foot without any narrative motivation, or Vindemitor, who falls from the tree by accident. It shows a conscious impetus to drive Castor's apotheosis.

Unlike Callisto and Chiron, the Dioscuri after their catasterism do retain an interest in human affairs, and attract worship as deities who are able to materially affect the mortal world and undertake work on behalf of their worshippers, as evidenced by Ovid's remark that the twins help ships in distress.⁸⁰ This is particularly noteworthy in light of Chiron's apotheosis: while Chiron's catasterism amounts to death within immortality, the transformation of the Dioscuri is negotiated within the narrative as a compromise between immortality and death. The brothers are subject to a kind of half-death, or at least are dead half the time, which implies that (catasterism as immortal death aside) half the time they are not dead, not confined, not removed from the world of the living. They are worshipped as active divinities because they are not fully bound by the underworld--even more, they have the extraordinary power to escape the underworld, which, considering their semi-mortal parentage, points to great power on their part: not even goddesses like Tacita are able to escape the underworld, and even Persephone was trapped down there against her will. The power of the Dioscuri within immortal realms is evident.

Orion and Aesculapius both follow the Hercules model, insofar as they are subject to deadly violence, only to be saved by divine intervention and catasterized. As discussed

⁸⁰ Their temple in the Roman Forum is highly recognizable today as the three isolated columns in the middle of ruins. Cornell (1995) 294 dates the temple to the fifth century BCE and briefly outlines its history. The significance of the Dioscuri within Augustan era Rome is discussed by Littlewood (2001) 932, who also makes much of the Dioscuri as twins and how this fact connects them to Romulus and Remus (934). Cf. Wiseman (1995) 91. For the representation of the Temple within the *Fasti*, see Green's 2004 article, 226-7. Ovid conflates the Dioscuri with Germanicus and Drusus at *Pont.* 2.2.83-4; cf. McGowan (2009) 70-1. The Dioscuri attracted worship in Latium as early as the archaic period, as evidenced by an inscription at the Altars of the Latin League; see Alföldi (1965) 268-71, Cornell (1995) 66-8 on the possible conflation of the Dioscuri with the Penates, whose status as divine twins was not so complex.

above, Orion is noteworthy for the mixed judgment the gods attach to him; like Callisto, Orion is caught in the center of warring divine powers, and it is difficult to discern whether his ultimate outcome is a reward or a punishment. Aesculapius is also noteworthy for the element of divine judgment visible in his story, but his is much clearer: initially, he is killed by Jupiter as punishment for raising Hippolytus from the dead. Apollo objects, and Jupiter agrees to promote Aesculapius to a constellation. In this case, the catasterism is presented as an improvement over death, but still a state that will keep Aesculapius from committing his former transgressions; while it is invested with a modicum of honor, it is not invested with any power.

At the beginning of the poem, catasterism is an idiosyncratic process that can illustrate many types of stories and meanings. Yet by the time one reaches Aesculapius' transformation near the end of June, the reader has seen a process that is initially unpredictable in its realization and meaning ossify into a predictable series of structural elements to mirror the other apotheoses in the work. In the end, the reader is faced with the inescapable message that apotheosis is contingent upon suffering, particularly for humans, and any possibility of escaping that certainty has flown. While some catasterized characters, such as the Twins, are able to wield certain powers from their place in heaven, most characters who are catasterized carry on for eternity, powerless to interact with the living world. Aesculapius' transformation marks a grim final catasterism for the *Fasti* and speaks to a sense of powerlessness to influence a world in which all real power is possessed by arbitrarily chosen individuals, namely the gods (including Augustus), who are unwilling to share their power and quickly thwart, with a nominal honor, anyone who surpasses what he is allowed to do.

CONCLUSION

The *Fasti* is invested in interactions between mortals and gods. Throughout the work the reader sees a sense of community in evidence between gods and mortals, and not only insofar as mortals are frequently able to join the ranks of the gods. The gods take time to have conversations with mortals, to explain to them the aetiologies of cult practices or to seek their input and cooperation in a new ritual. There is a sense throughout the work that mortal cooperation in divine endeavors is necessary, and that mortals will be rewarded for their cooperation with divine favor and a pretense of camaraderie. Unlike in the *Metamorphoses*, in which the gods constantly hover over mortals, waiting to inflict punishment at the first sign of neglect, the gods of the *Fasti* take an indulgent view of mortals and, on occasion, even adopt mortals into their elite community.

In the first chapter I considered other figures in the *Fasti* who appear as variations on the Hercules model. Ino, Anna Perenna, Julius Caesar, and Triptolemus all make appearances that play on the idea of suffering as a means to apotheosis, and yet none of them have the straightforward narrative that Hercules does in the *Metamorphoses*. Anna Perenna and Ino both have to undergo long narratives of suffering before they reach the critical moment in which they are apotheosed; in fact, Ino's story has been noticeably extended from the version in the *Metamorphoses*, in which the violence of her story quickly rose to a crisis and her apotheosis immediately followed. Julius Caesar's

apotheosis has also been altered from the parallel narrative in the *Metamorphoses*, in which he was sponsored by a different goddess. The divergence from the expected model and the previous accounts illustrates Ovid's playful attitude even toward what is ostensibly a serious subject, and forces the reader to take an active role in judging these narratives and interpreting them. In the cases of Anna Perenna and Ino, the story's aspect of suffering is substantially exaggerated, as is the goddesses' connection with Italy. In Julius Caesar's case, his supernaturally intimate connection with Roman divinities, and thus his appearance as a chosen martyr, is stressed, insofar as he is saved by the goddess Vesta, whose contact with men was strictly limited. Triptolemus is a brief story in which the sponsoring goddess herself initiates the violence necessary for the transformation.

In the second chapter I discussed Romulus' apotheosis as divided with Remus. Romulus' apotheosis in the *Fasti* is cast as a similarly fraught process with a martyring element, but in his case the martyrdom has been displaced onto his brother Remus. In contrast, Romulus' character is softened and potentially damaging elements of his character are downplayed such that his character in the *Fasti* becomes more or less unobjectionable. Any instances in earlier accounts in which Romulus caused harm to others or was disparaged by others have been smoothed over in the *Fasti*, and Romulus as a character is rendered inoffensive. Romulus is an essential figure to the Augustan agenda, and insofar as it would have been risky for Ovid to disparage him, Ovid is being careful with the character of Romulus in effort to avoid offending Augustus.

Nevertheless, this transition does not ever come painlessly. In the third chapter, I illustrated how certain women were accorded a promotion to higher divine status, but only after suffering the violence of rape. The violence to which these women are subject

is intense and clearly illustrates the martyring effect. The raped women are specified to gain some sort of new power and status as a consequence of their rape, whether they are assigned a special power among the gods or accorded status as the wife of an Olympian. This model is substantially different from the depiction of rape in the *Metamorphoses*, in which rape is usually not a vehicle to apotheosis; if a rape is transformative, the transformation confers a loss of status. Such women become birds, plants, or islands, and (with the exception of Callisto) do not approach any gain in power or status. Overall the rapes in the *Fasti* cultivate the impression that, while rape may be a violation, it can be easily compensated by conferring wealth or power on the victim, although the victim may have little say in how she is compensated.

The final chapter examines catasterisms as a class of apotheosis. This is a highly varied class of transformations, and the details are not necessarily made clear by Ovid, nor are they necessarily implied to be consistent: sometimes catasterisms are cast as a reward, sometimes as a punishment, sometimes as an exalted form of divine life, sometimes as a retreat from it. In most cases catasterism is depicted as a positive and desirable transformation, and over the course of the poem its connotation grows more consistent. As the *Fasti* goes on, the catasterism stories begin to reliably follow a model of saving characters from death by diverting them to catasterism. In this way, catasterism is cast as a salutary alternative to a grim eternity in the underworld.

Regarding Ovid's depictions of suffering as a means to immortality and the embedded martyring effect, the reader can make significant connections within the works of Ovid, importantly, to the poet's portrayal of himself. In the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, Ovid never stops reiterating his suffering; his misery is boundless,

and his repetition of the idea is interminable. Nevertheless, in *Tristia* 4.10 he proclaims, as clearly as he did in *Amores* 3.15 or *Metamorphoses* 15, that his works will live on beyond him, that he will achieve immortality after his death by the same means by which he accumulated such great suffering in his present life. Ovid in the exilic poetry never stops reiterating that Augustus lives as a god--but, wretched as he is, he does not step down from his own claim of transcendence and immortality.¹

With an unfinished work like the *Fasti*, there will always remain many questions for which it is hard to find a satisfying answer, and for this reason there is still plenty of work to be done in the study of the *Fasti*. One problem that has raised issues throughout this dissertation is the implied hierarchy of divine beings within Ovid's world. It seems obvious that Ovid's cosmos has a ranking system in which characters may be demoted (from humans to plants or inanimate objects) or promoted (from humans to divine characters); likewise, Ovid seems to differentiate between more powerful gods (Olympians) and less powerful gods (nymphs and minor deities). The catasterized figures likewise are set aside from other divinities, but their status is left frustratingly unclear throughout Ovid's works. Ovid does little to elucidate this system, and it is difficult to approach directly. A detailed examination (with a fresh perspective) of the limited evidence available would cast much illumination upon this dissertation.

Another subject that deserves further study is the distinction between Greek and Roman myths in Ovid's mythological works. The *Metamorphoses* is primarily devoted to Greek mythology, with a few Roman stories added near the end; the *Fasti* is a blend of Greek myths (primarily astronomical) and Roman myths (primarily aetiologies for Roman festivals and cult practices). Although I have addressed in this dissertation some

¹ McGowan (2009) 86.

of the distinctions between Greek and Roman myths, primarily by setting aside the catasterisms for separate consideration, there could be further work done in studying Ovid's sources for Greek as opposed to Roman myths, and how these differences in sources manifest themselves in Ovid's accounts of the myths. Rustic, agricultural cults surrounding minor Italian deities have in the past been regarded as more authentic and honestly believed than the affected, artificial cult practices imposed by the Roman state. As this perception changes to accommodate more nuanced understandings of Roman religion, we can approach a more insightful understanding of Ovid's different classes of gods, those who may have been described to him by simple, honest Roman farmers, and those who may have been described in pretentious Hellenistic poetry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Source Texts

Commentaries on Ovid's *Fasti*:

- Bailey, Cyril. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum Liber III*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921.
Bömer, Franz. *P. Ovidius Naso: Die Fasten*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1958.
Fantham, Elaine, ed. *Ovid Fasti Book IV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
Frazer, James George. *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1929.
Green, Steven J. *Ovid, Fasti 1: a Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
Littlewood, R. Joy. *A Commentary on Ovid: Fasti Book VI*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
Robinson, Matthew. *Ovid Fasti Book 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
Ursini, Francesco. *Ovidio Fasti 3: Commento filologico e critico-interpretativo ai vv. 1-516*. Milan: Simonelli, 2008.

Sources for ancient texts quoted in the body of this dissertation:

- Alton, E. H., D. E. W. Wormell, and E. Courtney. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*. 4th ed. Leipzig: Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1997.
Kenney, E. J., ed. *P. Ovidi Nasonis: Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
Mynors, R. A. B. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
Ogilvie, Robertus Maxwell. *Titi Livi: ab Urbe Condita*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.
Owen, S. G. *P. Ovidi Nasonis: Tristium Libri Quinque; Ibis; Ex Ponto Libri Quattuor; Halieutica; Fragmenta*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1915.
Powell, J. G. F. *M. Tulli Ciceronis: de Re Publica, de Legibus, Cato Maior de Senectute, Laelius de Amicitia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006.
Schoonhoven, Henk, ed. *The Pseudo-Ovidian ad Liviam de Morte Drusi: A Critical Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1992.
Skutsch, Otto, ed. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
Tarrant, R. J., ed. *P. Ovidi Nasonis: Metamorphoses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

General Bibliography

- Alföldi, A. *Early Rome and the Latins*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

- Arieti, James A. "Rape and Livy's View of Roman History," in *Rape in Antiquity*, edited by S. Deacy and K. F. Pierce, 209-29. London: Duckworth, 1997.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. "Discordant Muses." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 37 (1991): 1-21.
- . *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- . "Venus' Masterplot: Ovid and the Homeric Hymns," in *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception*, edited by Philip Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds, 112-26. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1999.
- Barrett, Anthony A. *Livia: First Lady of Imperial Rome*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Bartman, Elizabeth. *Portraits of Livia: Imaging the Imperial Woman in Augustan Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Beard, Mary. "A Complex of Times: No More Sheep on Romulus' Birthday." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 33 (1987): 1-15.
- Beard, Mary, John North, and Simon Price. *Religions of Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Beard, Mary and John Henderson. "The Emperor's New Body: Ascension from Rome," in *Parchments of Gender: Deciphering the Bodies of Antiquity*, edited by Maria Wyke, 191-219. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Beek, Anna Everett. "Gender Amender: Sex-Changing and Transgender Identities in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*," in *Invisible Cultures: Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*, edited by Viola Gheller and Francesco Carrer. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, in press.
- Bernstein, Alan E. *The Formation of Hell: Death and Retribution in the Ancient and Early Christian Worlds*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Boyd, Barbara Weiden. "Arms and the Man: Wordplay and the Catasterism of Chiron in Ovid *Fasti* 5." *American Journal of Philology* 122 (Spring, 2001): 67-80.
- Boyle, A. J. "Postscripts from the Edge: Exilic *Fasti* and Imperialized Rome." *Ramus* 26, no. 1/2 (1997): 7-28.
- . *Ovid and the Monuments: a Poet's Rome*. Victoria: Aureal Publications. 2003.
- Boyle, A. J. and R. D. Woodard. *Ovid: Fasti*. London: Penguin Books, 2000.
- Brandt, Paul. *P. Ovidi Nasonis: Amorum Libri Tres*. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1911.
- Brookes, Ian. "The Death of Chiron: Ovid, *Fasti* 5.379-414." *Classical Quarterly* 44, no. 2 (1994): 444-50.
- Brownmiller, Susan. *Against our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. 1975. Reprint, New York: Bantam Books, 1981.
- Brugnoli, Giorgio. "Anna Perenna" in *Cultura, Poesia, Ideologia nell'Opera di Ovidio*, edited by Italo Gallo and Luciano Nicastrì, 147-68. Salerno: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1991.
- Burroughs, Charles. "Talking with Goddesses: Ovid's *Fasti* and Botticelli's Primavera." *Word and Image* 28 (2012): 71-83.
- Calhoon, Cristina G. "Lucretia, Savior and Scapegoat: the Dynamics of Sacrifice in Livy 1.57-59." *Helios* 24, no. 2 (1997): 151-69.

- Clauss, M. *Kaiser und Gott: Herrscherkult im Römischen Reich*. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner, 1999.
- Coarelli, Filippo. *Periodo Arcaico*. Vol. 1 of *Il Foro Romano*. 2nd ed. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1986.
- Cohen, David. "Consent and Sexual Relations in Classical Athens," in *Consent and Coercion to Sex and Marriage in Ancient and Medieval Societies*, edited by Angeliki E. Laiou, 5-16. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1993.
- Connors, Catherine. "Ennius, Ovid, and Representations of Ilia." *Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi dei Testi Classici* 32 (1994): 99-112.
- Corbier, Mireille. "Male Power and Legitimacy through Women: the *Domus Augusta* under the Julio-Claudians," in *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments*, edited by Richard Hawley and Barbara Levick, 178-93. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Cornell, T. J. "Aeneas and the Twins: the Development of the Roman Foundation Legend." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 201 (1975): 1-32.
- . *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000-264 BC)*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Cumont, Franz. *After Life in Roman Paganism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1923.
- Curley, Dan. *Tragedy in Ovid: Theater, Metatheater, and the Transformation of a Genre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Curran, Leo C. "Rape and Rape Victims in the *Metamorphoses*." *Arethusa* 11 (1978): 213-242.
- Darcos, Xavier. *Ovide et la Mort*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2009.
- de Grummond, Nancy Thomson. *Etruscan Myth, Sacred History, and Legend*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 2006.
- de Luce, Judith. "O for a Thousand Tongues to Sing: a Footnote on Metamorphosis, Silence, and Power," in *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King*, edited by Mary DeForest, 305-21. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1993.
- Desport, Marie. "Matuta, l'Aurore chez Evandre." *Revue des Études Anciennes* 49 (1947): 111-29.
- Dixon, Suzanne. *The Roman Family*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- . *Reading Roman Women*. London: Duckworth, 2001.
- Domenicucci, Patrizio. "La Caratterizzazione Astrale delle Apoteosi di Romolo ed Ersilia nelle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio," in *Cultura, Poesia, Ideologia nell'Opera di Ovidio*, edited by Italo Gallo and Luciano Nicastrì, 221-8. Salerno: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1991.
- Donaldson, Ian. *The Rapes of Lucretia: a Myth and its Transformations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Dougherty, Carol. "Sowing the Seeds of Violence: Rape, Women, and the Land," in *Parchments of Gender*, edited by Maria Wyke, 267-84. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Drossart, P. "La Mort de Rémus chez Ovide." *Revue des Études Latines* 50 (1972): 187-204.
- Dufallo, Basil. *The Ghosts of the Past: Latin Literature, the Dead, and Rome's Transition to a Principate*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2007.

- Edwards, Catharine. *Death in Ancient Rome*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Evans, Jane DeRose. *The Art of Persuasion: Political Propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992.
- Evans-Grubbs, Judith. "Abduction Marriage in Antiquity: A Law of Constantine (CTh IX. 24. I) and Its Social Context." *Journal of Roman Studies* 79 (1989): 59-83.
- Fantham, Elaine. "Stuprum: Public Attitudes and Penalties for Sexual Offenses in Republican Rome." *Echos du Monde Classique* 35, n.s. 10 (1991): 267-91.
- . "Ceres, Liber and Flora: Georgic and Anti-Georgic Elements in Ovid's *Fasti*." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 38 (1993): 39-56.
- . *Latin Poets and Italian Gods*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- Farnell, Louis Richard. *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921.
- Feeney, D. C. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- . "Si licet et fas est: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate," in *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, edited by Anton Powell, 1-25. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1992.
- . *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Feldherr, Andrew. "Metamorphosis in the *Metamorphoses*," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, edited by Philip Hardie, 163-79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Felton, D. *Haunted Greece and Rome: Ghost Stories from Classical Antiquity*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999.
- Fetterley, Judith. *The Resisting Reader: a Feminist Approach to American Fiction*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1978.
- Finucane, R. C. *Appearances of the Dead: a Cultural History of Ghosts*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1984.
- Flory, Marleen B. "Abducta Neroni Uxor: The Historiographical Tradition on the Marriage of Octavian and Livia." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 118 (1988): 343-59.
- . "The Deification of Roman Women." *The Ancient History Bulletin* 9 (1995): 127-34.
- Fontenrose, Joseph. *Orion: the Myth of the Hunter and the Huntress*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Forbis, Elizabeth P. "Voice and Voicelessness in Ovid's Exile Poetry," in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VIII*, edited by Carl Deroux, 245-67. Brussels: Revue d'Études Latines, 1997.
- Fowler, W. Warde. *Roman Ideas of Deity in the Last Century before the Christian Era*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1914.
- Fox, Matthew. *Roman Historical Myths: the Regal Period in Augustan Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- . "Stars in the 'Fasti': Ideler (1825) and Ovid's Astronomy Revisited." *American Journal of Philology* 125, no. 1 (2004): 91-133.
- Gaca, Kathy L. "Sexual Violence in Ancient Warfare," in *Sexual Violence in Conflict Zones*, edited by Elizabeth D. Heineman, 73-88. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

- Galinsky, Karl. *The Herakles Theme: the Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972.
- . *Augustan Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- . "Vergil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as World Literature," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, edited by Karl Galinsky, 340-58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Gantz, Timothy. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Gardner, Jane F. *Women in Roman Law & Society*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- Gee, E. *Ovid, Aratus and Augustus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- . "Vaga Signa: Orion and Sirius in Ovid's *Fasti*," in *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*, edited by Geraldine Herbert-Brown, 47-70. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Gentilcore, Roxanne. "The Landscape of Desire: The Tale of Pomona and Vertumnus in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Phoenix* 49, no. 2 (1995): 110-20.
- Gosling, Anne. "Sending up the Founder: Ovid and the Apotheosis of Romulus." *Acta Classica* 45 (2002): 51-69.
- Gradel, Ittai. *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.
- Green, Carin. *Roman Religion and the Cult of Diana at Aricia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Green, Peter. *Ovid: the Erotic Poems*. London: Penguin, 1982.
- Green, Steven J. "Playing with Marble: the Monuments of the Caesars in Ovid's *Fasti*." *Classical Quarterly* 54, no. 1 (2004): 224-39.
- Grether, Gertrude. "Livia and the Roman Imperial Cult." *American Journal of Philology* 67, no. 3 (1946): 222-52.
- Hannah, Robert. *Greek & Roman Calendars: Constructions of Time in the Classical World*. London: Duckworth, 2005.
- Hardie, Philip. "Ovid's Theban History: the First 'Anti-Aeneid'?" *Classical Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (1990): 224-35.
- . "The Historian in Ovid: the Roman History of *Metamorphoses* 14-15," in *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, edited by D. S. Levene and D. P. Nelis, 191-209. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Harries, Byron. "Causation and the Authority of the Poet in Ovid's *Fasti*." *Classical Quarterly* 39, no. 1 (1989): 164-85.
- Harrison, Thomas. "Herodotus and the Ancient Greek Idea of Rape," in *Rape in Antiquity*, edited by S. Deacy and K. F. Pierce, 185-208. London: Duckworth, 1997.
- Heath, John. "Diana's Understanding of Ovid's 'Metamorphoses.'" *Classical Journal* 86, no. 3 (1991): 233-243.
- Heinze, Richard. *Ovids Elegische Erzählung*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1919.
- Hejduk, Julia D. "Epic Rapes in the *Fasti*." *Classical Philology* 106, no. 1 (2011): 20-31.
- Hemker, Julie. "Rape and the Founding of Rome." *Helios* 12, no. 1 (1985): 41-7.
- Herbert-Brown, Geraldine. *Ovid and the Fasti: an Historical Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

- Hexter, Ralph. "What was the Trojan Horse Made Of?: Interpreting Vergil's Aeneid." *Yale Journal of Criticism* 3 (1990): 109-31.
- Hinds, Stephen. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-conscious Muse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . "Generalizing about Ovid," in *The Imperial Muse: Ramus Essays on Roman Literature of the Empire*, edited by A. J. Boyle, 4-31. Victoria: Aureal Publications, 1987.
- . "Arma in Ovid's *Fasti*: Part 1: Genre and Mannerism." *Arethusa* 25, no. 1 (1992): 81-112.
- . "Arma in Ovid's *Fasti*: Part 2: Genre, Romulean Rome and Augustan Ideology." *Arethusa* 25, no. 1 (1992): 113-53.
- Ideler, Christian Ludwig. "Über den Astronomischen Theil der *Fasti* des Ovid," in *Abhandlungen der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin aus den Jahren 1822-3*, 137-69. Berlin: Reimer, 1825.
- James, Sharon L. "Slave-Rape and Female Silence in Ovid's Love Poetry." *Helios* 24, no. 1 (1997): 60-76.
- Jenkins, Thomas E. "Livia the *Princeps*: Gender and Ideology in the *Consolatio ad Liviam*." *Helios* 36, no. 1 (2009): 1-25.
- Johnson, Patricia J. "Ovid's Livia in Exile." *Classical World* 90, no. 6 (1997): 403-20.
- Johnson, W. R. "The Desolation of the 'Fasti.'" *Classical Journal* 74, no. 1 (1978): 7-18.
- . "The Rapes of Callisto." *Classics Journal* 92, no. 1 (1996): 9-24.
- Johnston, Sarah Iles. *Restless Dead: Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Joplin, Patricia Klindienst. "Ritual Work on Human Flesh: Livy's Lucretia and the Rape of the Body Politic." *Helios* 17, no. 1 (1990): 51-70.
- Joshel, Sandra R. "The Body Female and the Body Politic: Livy's Lucretia and Verginia," in *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, edited by Amy Richlin, 112-130. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Keegan, Peter Mark. "Seen, not Heard: *Feminea Lingua* in Ovid's *Fasti* and the Critical Gaze," in *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*, edited by Geraldine Herbert-Brown, 129-53. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Keith, A. M. *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Kenney, Edward J., ed. *Ovidio: Metamorfosi, libri VII-IX*. Vol. 4. Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 2011.
- Kimpton, Frederick. "The *Fasti*'s Celestial World and the Limitations of Astronomical Knowledge." *Classical Philology* 109, no. 1 (2014): 26-47.
- Koss, Mary P. "Rape: Scope, Impact, Interventions, and Public Policy Responses." *American Psychologist* 48, no. 10 (1993): 1062-9.
- Kötzle, Martina. *Weibliche Gottheiten in Ovids "Fasten"*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1991.
- Krevans, Nita. "Ilia's Dream: Ennius, Virgil, and the Mythology of Seduction." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 95 (1993): 257-71.
- Larson, J. L. *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Lee, A. G. "Ovid's 'Lucretia.'" *Greece and Rome* 22 (1953): 107-18.
- Lefkowitz, Mary R. *Women in Greek Myth*. London: Duckworth, 1986.
- Leigh, Matthew. "Two Notes on Ovid." *Classical Quarterly* 50, no. 1 (2000): 311-3.

- Levene, D. S. "Defining the Divine in Rome." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 142, no. 1 (2012): 41-81.
- Lindheim, Sara. "Pomona's Pomarium: the 'Mapping Impulse' in *Metamorphoses* 14 (and 9)." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 140, no. 1 (2010): 163-94.
- Littlewood, R. Joy. "Ovid and the Ides of March (*Fasti* 3.523-710): a Further Study in the Artistry of the *Fasti*," in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History II*, edited by Carl Deroux, 301-21. Brussels: Revue d'Études Latines, 1980.
- . "Ovid among the Family Dead: the Roman Founder Legend and Augustan Iconography in Ovid's *Feralia* and *Lemuria*." *Latomus* 60, no. 4 (2001): 916-35.
- Liveley, Genevieve. "Reading Resistance in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*," in *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception*, edited by Philip Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds, 197-213. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1999.
- Lozano, Fernando. "The Creation of Imperial Gods: Not Only Imposition versus Spontaneity," in *More than Men, Less than Gods: Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship*, edited by Panagiotis P. Iossif, Andrzej S. Chankowski, and Catharine C. Lorber, 475-519. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- Luisi, Aldo and Nicoletta F. Berrino. *L'Ironia di Ovidio verso Livia e Tiberio*. Bari: Edipuglia, 2010.
- Martin, Christopher. "A Reconsideration of Ovid's *Fasti*." *Illinois Classical Studies* 10, no. 2 (1985): 261-74.
- Matthes, Melissa M. *The Rape of Lucretia and the Founding of Republics: Readings in Livy, Machiavelli, and Rousseau*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000.
- McDonough, Christopher Michael. "Carna, Proca and the Strix on the Kalends of June." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 127 (1997): 315-44.
- . "The Hag and the Household Gods: Silence, Speech, and the Family in Mid-February (Ovid *Fasti* 2.533-638)." *Classical Philology* 99, no. 4 (October 2004): 354-69.
- McGowan, Matthew M. *Ovid in Exile: Power and Poetic Redress in the Tristia and the Epistulae ex Ponto*. Boston: Brill, 2009.
- McKeown, J. C. "Fabula Proposito Nulla Tegenda Meo: Ovid's *Fasti* and Augustan Politics," in *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, edited by Anthony John Woodman and David Alexander West, 169-87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Merli, Elena. "Esculapio e Chirone in 'Fasti e Metamorfosi': Tradizione Mitologica e Definizione del Genere Letterario." *Hermes* 132 (2004): 459-71.
- Miller, John F. "Ovid's Divine Interlocutors in the *Fasti*," in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History III*, edited by Carl Deroux, 156-92. Bruxelles: Revue d'Études Latines, 1983.
- . "The *Fasti* and Hellenistic Didactic: Ovid's Variant Aetiologies." *Arethusa* 25, no. 1 (1992): 11-31.
- Monella, Paolo. "Lara, ἡ ἄρτιον, l'etimo (Ov. *Fast.* 2, 583-616)," in *Nunc Teritur Nostros Area Maior Equis: Riflessioni sull'Intertestualità Ovidiana--i Fasti*, edited by Luciano Landolfi, 47-68. Palermo: Flaccovio, 2004.

- Moses, Diana C. "Livy's Lucretia and the Validity of Coerced Consent in Roman Law," in *Consent and Coercion to Sex and Marriage in Ancient and Medieval Societies*, edited by Angeliki E. Laiou, 39-81. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1993.
- Murgatroyd, Paul. "Plotting in Ovidian Rape Narratives." *Eranos* 98 (2000): 75-92.
- . "Ceres' Informants in Ovid." *Eranos* 101 (2003): 129-32.
- . "Ovid, *Fasti* 2.585-616 and Virgil, *Aeneid* 12." *Classical Quarterly* 53, no. 1 (2003): 311-3.
- . *Mythical and Legendary Narrative in Ovid's Fasti*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Myers, K. Sara. *Ovid's Causes: Cosmology and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.
- . *Ovid: Metamorphoses, Book XIV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Mynors, R. A. B. *Virgil: Georgics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Newlands, Carole E. *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- . "Connecting the Disconnected: Reading Ovid's *Fasti*," in *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, edited by Sharrock and Morales, 171-202. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . "Mandati Memores: Political and Poetic Authority in the *Fasti*," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, edited by Philip R. Hardie, 200-16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- O'Bryhim, Shawn. "Ovid's Version of Callisto's Punishment." *Hermes* 118 (1990): 75-80.
- Ogden, Daniel. *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds: a Sourcebook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Ogilvie, R. M. *A Commentary on Livy: Books 1-5*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Omitowoju, Rosanna. *Rape and the Politics of Consent in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Palmer, Robert E. A. "Cupra, Matuta, and Venilia Pyrgensis," in *Classical Studies Presented to Ben Edwin Perry by his Students and Colleagues at the University of Illinois, 1924-60*, 292-309. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1969.
- Pandey, Nandini B. "Caesar's Comet, the Julian Star, and the Invention of Augustus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 143, no. 2. (2013): 405-49.
- Panoussi, Vassiliki. *Greek Tragedy in Vergil's "Aeneid": Ritual, Empire, and Intertext*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Parker, Hugh. *Greek Gods in Italy in Ovid's Fasti: A Greater Greece*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1997.
- . "The Romanization of Ino (*Fasti* 6.475-550)." *Latomus* 58, no. 2 (1999): 336-47.
- Parry, Hugh. "Ovid's Metamorphoses: Violence in a Pastoral Landscape." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 95 (1964): 268-82.
- Pasco-Pranger, Molly. *Founding the Year: Ovid's Fasti and the Poetics of the Roman Calendar*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Philippides, S. N. "Narrative Strategies and Ideology in Livy's 'Rape of Lucretia.'" *Helios* 10, no. 2 (1983): 113-9.
- Phillips, C. Robert III. "Roman Religion and Literary studies of Ovid's *Fasti*." *Arethusa* 25 (1992): 55-80.

- Platner, Samuel. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Rev. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929.
- Pontone, Anthony G. "Fratricide as the Founding Myth of Rome: the Roman Historiographical Perspective." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1986.
- Porte, Danielle. *L'Étiologie Religieuse dans les Fastes d'Ovide*. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1985.
- Porter, Roy. "Rape--Does it have a Historical Meaning?" in *Rape: An Historical and Cultural Enquiry*, edited by Sylvana Tomaselli and Roy Porter, 216-36. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- Raval, Shilpa. "Pudibunda Ora: Gender, Sexuality, and Language in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1998.
- Rea, Jennifer A. *Legendary Rome: Myths, Monuments, and Memory on the Palatine and Capitoline*. London: Duckworth, 2007.
- Reddington, Frances P. and Betsy Wright Kreisel. *Sexual Assault: the Victims, the Perpetrators, and the Criminal Justice System*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2005.
- Richlin, Amy. "Reading Ovid's Rapes," in *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, edited by Amy Richlin, 158-79. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Robinson, Matthew. "Festivals, Fools, and the *Fasti*: the *Quirinalia* and the *Feriae Stultorum* (Ovid, *Fast.* II 475-532)." *Aevum Antiquum* 3 (2003): 609-21.
- . "Ovid, the *Fasti* and the Stars." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 50, no. 1 (2007): 129-159.
- Rohde, Alfredus. *De Ovidi Arte Epica Capita Duo*. Berlin: Emil Ebering, 1929.
- Rutledge, E. S. "Ovid's Informants in the *Fasti*," in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History II*, edited by Carl Deroux, 322-31. Brussels: Revue d'Études Latines, 1980.
- . "Vergil and Ovid on the Tiber." *Classical Journal* 75, no. 4 (1980): 301-4.
- Salvadori, Emanuela. "La Struttura Narrativa dei "Matralia:" Ovidio "Fasti" vi 473-562." *Sandalion* 5 (1982): 205-21.
- Salzman, M. R. "Deification in the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*," in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IX*, edited by Carl Deroux, 313-46. Brussels: Revue d'Études Latines, 1998.
- Santini, Carlo. "Motivi Astronomici e Moduli Didattici nei Fasti di Ovidio." *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 27 (1975): 1-26.
- Santoro L'Hoir, Francesca. *The Rhetoric of Gender Terms: 'Man,' 'Woman,' and the Portrayal of Character in Latin Prose*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Segal, Charles. "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Greek Myth in Augustan Rome." *Studies in Philology* 68, no. 4 (1971): 371-94.
- . "Ovid's Metamorphic Bodies: Art, Gender, and Violence in the 'Metamorphoses.'" *Arion* 5, no. 3 (1998): 9-41.
- Severy, Beth. *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Shapiro, H. A. "Cult Warfare: the Dioskouroi between Sparta and Athens," in *Ancient Greek Hero Cult*, edited by Robin Hägg, 99-107. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag, 1999.

- Solodow, Joseph B. *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Stearns, John Barker. "Studies of the Dream as a Technical Device in Latin Epic and Drama." Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1927.
- Stok, Fabio. "L'Ambiguo Romolo dei *Fasti*," in *Cultura, Poesia, ed Ideologia nell'Opera di Ovidio*, edited by Italo Gallo and Luciano Nicastrì, 183-212. Salerno: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1991.
- Syme, Ronald. *History in Ovid*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Tabeling, Ernst. *Mater Larum: zum Wesen der Larenreligion*. New York: Arno Press, 1975.
- Tissol, Garth. "The House of Fame: Roman History and Augustan Politics in *Metamorphoses* 11-15," in *Companion to Ovid*, edited by Barbara Weiden Boyd, 305-35. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Treggiari, Susan. "Consent to Roman Marriage: Some Aspects of Law and Reality." *Echos du Monde Classique* 26 (1982): 34-44.
- . *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Wagenvoort, H. "The Crime of Fratricide (Hor. *Epod.* 7, 18): The Figure of Romulus-Quirinus in the Political Struggle of the 1st Century B.C.," in *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion*, edited by H. Wagenvoort, 169-83. Leiden: Brill, 1956.
- Walcot, Peter. "Herodotus on Rape." *Arethusa* 11 (1978): 137-47.
- Wilkinson, L. P. *Ovid Recalled*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955.
- Williams, Craig A. *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Williams, R. D. *Virgil: the Eclogues & Georgics*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1979.
- Winkes, Rolf. *Livia, Octavia, Iulia : Porträts und Darstellungen*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Art and Archaeology Publications, 1995.
- Wiseman, Anne and Peter Wiseman. *Ovid: Fasti*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Wiseman, T. P. "The Wife and Children of Romulus." *Classical Quarterly* 33, no. 2 (1983): 445-52.
- . *Remus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- . *The Myths of Rome*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2004.
- Wood, Susan E. *Imperial Women: A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C.-A.D. 68*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Zissos, Andrew. "The Rape of Proserpina in Ovid *Met.* 5.341-661: Internal Audience and Narrative Distortion." *Phoenix* 53, no. 1/2 (1999): 97-113.

APPENDIX A

FURTHER TRANSFORMATIONS: LUCRETIA AND LIVIA

The preceding chapters have discussed the narratives of apotheosis as presented in the *Fasti*, and how the process of apotheosis is consistently and inextricably intertwined with violence suffered by the person transformed. In fact, this correlation is so reliable that almost all violent episodes related within the *Fasti* are part of an apotheosis narrative. Beyond these, however, there are a few stories in the *Fasti* that, while they do not relate an apotheosis as a narrative, nevertheless allude to the divinity of figures who, in Ovid's lifetime, were not commonly described as divinities. Ovid is unique in his decisions to describe Lucretia and Livia in divine terms, and even though neither woman is provided within the *Fasti* with a narrative of how she attained divine status, each of these deserves examination in this dissertation.

Lucretia

The story of Lucretia is one well-known to Roman authors and audiences; indeed, Lucretia is one of the most celebrated heroes of the Roman republic. The outrage¹

¹ I will be discussing Tarquinius' attack on Lucretia as a rape, even though the embedded issues of consent are legally more complex and vary from telling to telling, on which see Moses (1993). For the purposes of

committed against her by a member of the ruling family, and her decision to set a precedent by committing suicide neatly encapsulate the grievances of the Roman people against the monarchy. In short, she is a highly symbolic person, someone who is considered more important in Roman history as a symbol of bravery in the face of injustice than as an individual,² and thus is she routinely treated in literature.

Here I will examine Ovid's description of Lucretia³ in the context of violence and the supernatural. The story of Lucretia is well-known, and its violent aspects are clear: Lucretia receives her kinsman Sextus Tarquinius as a guest while her husband is away; Sextus attacks her in her bedroom in the middle of the night and, by means of many threats of violence and degradation, forces her to have sex with him. Unable to bear the shame of having been thus attacked, she calls a number of witnesses and describes the events to them, and, in defiance of their counsel, kills herself with a dagger. When other Romans hear of her rape and suicide, they are outraged at how she has been wronged, and this attack against her becomes a motivation to overthrow the monarchy.⁴ The supernatural aspect has been added by Ovid where it is not found in most accounts: Brutus' vow over Lucretia's corpse, and the divine transformation and power attributed to her, set the fate of Ovid's Lucretia apart from that of the Lucretias in other authors. Moreover, the historical setting of this rape, and its implications to Roman politics historical and contemporary, set this supernatural transformation well apart from the

Roman law, rape and adultery are both subcategories of *stuprum*, but adultery was much more heavily legislated and prominent in the social consciousness at Ovid's time, on which see Fantham (1991), Williams (2010) 103-36, Gardner (1991) 127-31. For the purposes of this dissertation, Tarquinius' attack on Lucretia as reported in the *Fasti* can be read as a rape because Ovid engages the same model of a woman whose consent is violated as he uses in other rape stories in the *Fasti* (as outlined in chapter three).

² Cf. Keith (2000) 102, and passim in Keith's chapter five; cf. Joplin (1990).

³ *Fasti* 2.721-852.

⁴ Unrestrained sexual offenses against private citizens are a common complaint against tyrants in the ancient world and are presented as symbolic of the emasculation of the citizenry; see e.g. Calhoun (1997), Cohen (1993); cf. the assassination of Hipparchus by Harmodius and Aristogeiton, Thucydides 6.55-9.

mythic rapes discussed in chapter three.⁵ Ovid's Lucretia is unique in a number of important ways.

Let me begin by establishing the context in which Ovid writes of Lucretia. In his book *The Rapes of Lucretia*, Ian Donaldson has admirably discussed how, in literature, Lucretia is typically portrayed as a symbol more than a character. Livy's Lucretia succumbs most fully to this tendency, becoming something akin to a marble statue of Pudicitia,⁶ what Robinson calls a "stern *matrona* from the hardy ancient mould"⁷ instead of the more vulnerable elegiac mistress she is in Ovid. Livy's Lucretia is all too conscious of the precedent she sets, famously forbidding *nec ulla deinde impudica Lucretiae exemplo uiuet*,⁸ and, true to form, Livy's Lucretia is taken overwhelmingly as the source material for such authors as Ovid.⁹ Yet Ovid's Lucretia does not express any concern over the possibility of setting precedent. The final justification given for her suicide is a personal concern, almost selfishly absorbed in self-pity when set beside Livy's Lucretia's final words: "*quam*" dixit "*veniam vos datis, ipsa nego.*"¹⁰ She is not concerned with the effect her actions will have on future generations in Roman law; she

⁵ In chapter three I stressed the significance of the rape victims' independence from a family structure such as would have been important in a legal proceeding: in those rape stories, the rape is framed as an offense against the woman and her own violated consent, rather than--as would have been central to a historical legal proceeding--an offense against her male guardian. Lucretia, as a Roman matron who is described as living under the real-life Roman legal system, on the contrary does fit into a conventional legal context. Her unchastity should be construed, in legal terms, primarily as an offense against her husband, even if Ovid's elegiac tone does lay stress upon her personal reaction to the offense and her unwillingness to have sexual intercourse with Tarquinius. For this reason it is significant that Lucretia's apotheosis, such as it is, is effected not by her rape per se but by the reaction it provokes among the male members of her family. For the legal and social issues at work in Lucretia's rape, see Fantham (1991), Moses (1993), Joplin (1990), Gardner (1991) 117-25, Dixon (2001) 51.

⁶ Santoro L'Hoir (1992) also alludes to Livy's Lucretia as being devoid of personality, asserting that "Livy's female characters are one-dimensional. Reminiscent of the 'little girl' with the 'little curl in the middle of her forehead,' when they are good, they are 'very, very good,' and when they are bad, they are not only 'horrid,' but also infinitely more interesting" (Santoro L'Hoir 77).

⁷ Robinson (2011) 473.

⁸ Livy 1.58.

⁹ For Livy's use of Lucretia as an exemplum, see Joshel (1992) 114-5.

¹⁰ *Fasti* 2.830.

cannot even see beyond her immediate troubles to a time when she might not be so consumed with shame.¹¹ Unlike Livy's Lucretia, she does not make her kinsmen swear to avenge her rape and consequent suicide, much less make sweeping political statements that reveal a desire to remove the kings; Brutus vows revenge of his own accord. My primary concern with Lucretia is how, after her death, she is represented and used by Brutus. As Lucretia's story unfolds, much stress is laid on what Lucretia experiences and feels, and for this reason it is striking that when the story draws to a close, Brutus takes her story and spins it to his own benefit. His assertion of Lucretia's divinity is done in service of his political agenda and is not reflective of her experience. In service of his quest for political change, Brutus attributes divine status to Lucretia, and molds this ostensibly divine figure's message to advance his own ends.

In these literary treatments, Brutus abets Lucretia's propensity to be read as a symbol rather than an individual by taking her personal grievance (since the rape is generally understood to be a violation of her person, and her family honor) and airing it as a political issue.¹² Her suffering, as Brutus announces, is significant not because he sympathizes with her, but rather because it illustrates the corruption within the monarchy and will garner him support in his quest for revolution. As her story is related in the *Fasti*, Lucretia becomes more abstract and impersonal than ever, and Brutus' reaction to her suicide serves even more to transform her from a person into an icon of political

¹¹ Robinson (2011) refers to Ovid's Lucretia as "the elegist's ultimate fantasy" (Robinson 462), the level of which idealization highlights the fact that she is not being considered as an individual with her own personality and life and is only a paragon for others (not, conspicuously, Ovid or other men) to emulate.

¹² What McDonough (2004) calls "a jarring mixture of private misfortune and public benefit" (McDonough 362). Ovid here follows Livy's model, which Philippides (1983) 113 calls an "ideology in which the political issues are identified with and/or concealed by moralistic views." Cf. Arieti (1997), Keith (2000), Calhoon (1997).

action.¹³ As Lucretia lies dying before her witnesses, Brutus makes a vow over her corpse:

*per tibi ego hunc juro fortem castumque cruorem,
perque tuos manes, qui mihi numen erunt...*

I swear to you, by this spilled blood, brave and chaste, and by your *manes*, which for me will hereafter be a *numen*...¹⁴

Brutus' comment is highly evocative of the deification of early imperial-era political figures. He has identified a dead mortal to whom is attributed a great service to the state,¹⁵ and he promises to worship her *numen*, that is, her divine spirit or power, in the future. She is identified as the catalyst for the revolution from the monarchy to the republic, and, in taking a stand ostensibly for principle (her refusal to exonerate herself for being raped), is made a martyr for justice, chastity, and all the traditional ideals of the Roman matron. One may call her a Founding Mother, or even a Foundation Heroine.

But how much does Lucretia really have in common with Brutus, or other Founding Fathers of the Roman Republic? In truth, very little. It is misleading to call her a hero, because rather than taking a role in organizing the revolution, she is made into an idea around which the revolution can organize. Essentially, she transforms herself from a real person with goals and abilities into an abstract symbol with no power to

¹³ I find Brutus' political usage of Lucretia's story problematic, primarily because once she commits suicide, she loses the ability to speak for herself, and her actions and experiences are interpreted--it may be an exaggeration to say "exploited"--by others for their own purposes. But the question of Lucretia's agency in the political change attributed to her, and her ability to designate the meaning of her own actions, will be addressed below, although it does significantly engage the idea of Brutus granting her *numen* while simultaneously taking control of her political capital--and, one presumes, her *numen* as well.

¹⁴ *Fasti* 2.841-2. Strangely, no commentators on this passage remark upon Brutus' elevation of Lucretia's *manes* to a *numen*. Bömer's (1958) only note on Brutus' oath is a syntactic point relating to the word order. While Robinson (2011) at least addresses the oath itself, he does not mention Lucretia as the guarantor of the oath.

¹⁵ In this case, providing a pretext for the republican revolution.

communicate or work her will.¹⁶ She flees her predicament and leaves the fate of the state in the hands of others.

Let me stress that the use of the term *numen* is noteworthy in and of itself. *Numen* is not a word that is used casually in Latin; it has significance as word denoting the divine, and is used throughout the *Fasti* in connection with the supernatural. If Brutus is using it for rhetorical effect, he is putting inordinate rhetorical force behind his statement. Newlands, Landolfi, and Feeney (1992) particularly stress the interaction of speech and gender in the *Fasti*, how Lucretia is categorically deprived of speech throughout her story, and how her silenced state is tied to her lack of power.¹⁷ This silence, they mark, is part of a larger pattern of victims subjugated to the powers of others and silenced in *Fasti* 2, which Feeney connects to Ovid's problems with censorship, conflicts with those in power, and constraint of free speech. Considering Ovid's Lucretia's lack of speech and related lack of power, it is curious that she should be honored with recognition of her *numen*, since usually *numina* were something strongly affiliated with temporal power.¹⁸

Yet the process of deification is a lengthy multi-step process, not defined by any single event or distinction.¹⁹ One may receive any number of quasi-divine honors while alive; one may also be formally recognized as a *divus* by the Roman government after

¹⁶ Cf. Beard and Henderson's (1998) statement that (in the context of Roman imperial deifications) "deification enacted the power of the deifier rather than the deified" (Beard and Henderson 199). Matthes (2000) 38 argues that Livy's Lucretia in fact exercises control over her fate by acquiescing to endure the rape rather than allow herself to be killed and framed for committing adultery with a slave, but this Hobson's choice has little practical significance for her: whether she is raped and killed by Sextus or raped by Sextus and killed by her own hand, she will not live to reap any benefits from her good reputation.

¹⁷ Newlands (1995) 148 contrasts Ovid's silent Lucretia to Livy's extraordinarily eloquent one. See also Feeney (1992).

¹⁸ Gradel (2002) 326: "In the *Apocolocyntosis*, Claudius goes to heaven; in Roman terms, his absolute power as emperor made his candidacy a strong one."

¹⁹ Feeney (1998), Gradel (2002) chapter three, Beard, North, and Price (1998) 140-9, 206-9. Cf. Flory (1995). Lozano (2011) discusses the process by which the worship of Roman emperors became widely accepted, particularly in the provinces. Fowler (1914) lecture V ("Deification of Caesar") speculates on how the Roman populace may have reacted to the introduction of ruler cult.

death. The final step of the process, however, is acceptance into Olympus, recognition as divine by the divine. Gradel asserts that this decision rests entirely on the knees of the immortals and, moreover, is wholly unconnected to mortal religious practice²⁰--as such, Gradel splits the practical notion of divinity as recognized by the Roman state from “absolute” divinity as seen from a divine perspective. In Gradel’s analysis, Romans worship two classes of gods: the exalted individuals who possess absolute divinity, and those lesser individuals who are merely recognized as divine in mortal religion. Within Ovid’s poems the reader for the most part sees the first type, undeniable gods with some empirical superhuman essence, the divine part that remains to Hercules when he burns his mortal material away.²¹ In his description of Lucretia’s *numen*, Ovid hints at the appearance of the second type within the *Fasti*.

Generally in Ovidian apotheosis narratives, the person is apotheosed on divine, not mortal initiative: the change results from one god advocating to the other gods on behalf of the mortal apotheosed.²² Yet for Lucretia we do have a narrative, and unlike that of the others, the narrative does not take place on Olympus, but rather on earth. The fact that she does not have a god advocating on her behalf sets her apart from Ovid’s other apotheosis narratives, and, as I would argue, makes this not a true elevation to divinity, a change of cosmic status for our heroine Lucretia, but a political gesture on

²⁰ Gradel (2002) 329: “Humans can, according to Seneca, elevate a man to heaven; only the gods, however, decide if he will actually be admitted.”

²¹ Jupiter on the death of Hercules, *Met.* 9.251-3: *nec nisi materna Vulcanum parte potentem/sentiet; aeternum est a me quod traxit et expers/atque immune necis nullaue domabile flamma.*

²² Myers (2009) 9: “Ovid’s depiction of Roman deifications in the *Met.* shares an epic emphasis on divine action rather than on panegyric enumeration of exploits, which seemed to have formed the basis of earlier Roman tradition.” Myers argues that this aspect relates the process of deification in the divine realm to politicking in the Roman government, and further that this demotion of a sublime process to the mortal level has a comic effect. I would argue against the comic aspect in the case of Lucretia, since the overwhelming tragedy of her experience seems to dampen any possibility of humor in Brutus’ words, but the fact that her deification arises on mortal initiative is very significant. Cf. my discussion of the Hercules model in chapter one.

Brutus' part. To take a very prosaic reading of this passage, it bears pointing out that there is no cult of Lucretia or her *numen* in Rome at any known time. Brutus' promise is made in service of his own ambition and opportunity (becoming as he does one of the first consuls of the new republic). More importantly, one cannot ignore the fact that historical deifications of mortals by the Roman state are always undertaken with an eye to political ends more than any other purpose; as Gradel says, "Obviously virtue was not what gained access to the state pantheon [for Claudius]...being Nero's father was what counted."²³ Again, Corbier alleges²⁴ that Livia was formally made a *diva* for no other reason than to legitimize Claudius' ancestry: since he was not a descendent of Augustus and was never adopted by any of his predecessors, he needed to acquire some extraordinarily distinguished ancestors of his own. One cannot take the politics out of religion, even in the long-ago case of Lucretia.

In this light, one must consider the question of what rationale lay behind the practice of deifying Roman politicians, particularly the practice of the Senate officially confirming new gods postmortem. Gradel compares the Hellenistic practice of deifying living rulers, stressing the ethos of reciprocity: Hellenistic subjects worshipped their living rulers because of the services that they could provide for them, while ignoring the dead kings of the past; Romans, because of the unfortunate timing of Julius Caesar's death,²⁵ worshipped the dead and declined to deify the living. The revered dead rulers, in this case, are invoked by living politicians in support of their own rule, which is how

²³ Gradel (2002) 329.

²⁴ Corbier (1995) 185.

²⁵ Gradel (2002) argues that Julius Caesar was swiftly approaching divine worship while he was still alive; his death interrupted the process before he could reach full dignity of divine worship, and for this reason the divinity was applied to a dead man, and Roman emperor worship was thereafter inextricably tied to the dead. See Gradel's chapter three. Cf. Pandey (2013) 441, who notes in *Met.* 15 Venus' horrified surprise that Caesar's apotheosis must necessarily be preceded by his death.

Brutus here uses Lucretia. Newlands also marks how efficiently Brutus exploits Lucretia's death for his own political gain: he displays Lucretia's corpse and takes advantage of her death with much more selfish ambition than the Brutus of Livy, for example.²⁶ His oath regarding her *numen*, in that light, is part of a larger plan to demonstrate his sincerity to avenge the wrongs of the Tarquinii and bring down his relatives so that he can gain political power.

It is useful to compare the representation of Caesar's apotheosis/deification within the *Fasti*, and Ovid's assertion that while Romulus attained divinity through his parentage--that is, he was made a god by his father--Augustus did the opposite, he made his father a god: *caelestem facit te pater, ille patrem*.²⁷ In studying the history of Caesar and Augustus within Roman religion, it makes an interesting puzzle to ask whether Augustus deified Caesar or vice versa. For official purposes it was Augustus who instituted Caesar's deification and enshrined Divus Julius within the state pantheon. On the other hand, Augustus' status as *Divi Filius* was what enabled much of his success in life and paved the way for Augustus' own deification. While this recursive chicken-and-egg question might provide fodder for speculation, within the *Fasti*, Ovid strictly holds to the Augustan answer: it was Augustus who made Caesar a god, and not the other way around.²⁸ The implication takes a decidedly earthbound view of deification, following Gradel's reasoning: relative divinity can be an honor conferred by mortals upon other (usually dead) mortals, separate from the absolute divinity that guarantees entrance to Olympus. The effect of this final flourish is to assert Augustus' control over religious

²⁶ Newlands (1995) 153. Cf. Joplin (1990) 64, who says that (Livy's) Lucretia "has far more power as a corpse than as a living woman."

²⁷ *Fasti* 2.144 (at the end of the syncrisis between Romulus and Augustus).

²⁸ Salzman (1998) 339-40 calls attention to Augustus' active role here, but is principally interested in how it compares to Caesar's deification in the *Met*.

practice and his superiority to his predecessors, with Romulus' passive transformation to a god unfavorably compared to Augustus' active effort to transform Caesar--meanwhile implying that deification is indeed something that mortals can effect of their own accord, and indeed to their own credit. Brutus' action, then, can follow the same model, in which a mortal attributes divinity to a person of importance without waiting for a signal from Olympus that worship is due to this person.

Yet this recognition of *numen* could be declined by the person whose *numen* was offered worship if he or she felt unworthy. One may instructively compare a similar episode in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, in which Aeneas expresses his gratitude to the Sibyl for guiding him through the underworld: '*seu dea tu praesens seu dis gratissima...numinis instar eris semper mihi*.' "Whether you are a *dea praesens* or just very blessed by the gods, you will always be the equivalent of a *numen* to me."²⁹ Although the Sibyl rejects his worship ('*nec dea sum...nec sacri turis honore/humanum dignare caput*,' "I am not a *dea*, so do not exalt this human head with the honor of sacred incense"),³⁰ his statement reflects an attempt by a mortal to deify another mortal without explicit divine sponsorship, just as Brutus' vow to Lucretia does. Compared to Brutus, Aeneas' promise to the Sibyl contains less motivation for political gain: Aeneas' trip to the underworld is not an event that Aeneas can exploit for political advancement, although it may be an extraordinary honor that would enhance his superhuman reputation and encourage others to respect him.³¹

²⁹ *Met.* 14.123-4.

³⁰ *Met.* 14.130-1. Regarding this passage Myers (2009) notes that "Here, however, the Sibyl's rejection of divine honours for a human sounds a potentially odd note in a book full of apotheoses" (Myers 84), but she does not elaborate on the implications of the Sibyl's rejection. She does, however, draw a connection to Venus' rejection of Aeneas' worship in *Aen.* 1.

³¹ In the *Aeneid*, as well as in Ovid's recapitulation of Aeneas' life in the *Met.*, Aeneas (as far as can be observed) speaks little to others of his experience in the underworld and his discussions with the Sibyl.

In this discussion of what divine honors mean and what it means, more importantly, to refuse them, the Sibyl's response merits its own attention, for she gives a specific reason for declining. After informing Aeneas that she is not a *dea*, she proceeds to tell him just how close she came to becoming one: *lux aeterna mihi carituraque fine dabatur,/si mea virginitas Phoebus patuisset amanti*: "An eternal and endless life would have been given to me, if my virginity had permitted Apollo as a lover."³² The Sibyl implies that, had she accepted Apollo's offer of long life coupled with eternal youth, she would have been a *dea* in a position to rightly accept Aeneas' worship. Not having done so, and therefore not being a *dea*, she declines the worship as inappropriate, implying that, first, as Levene describes,³³ immortal youth is the defining feature of gods and is sufficient to define gods, such that even people who would have otherwise been ordinary mortals can gain all the benefits of divinity by virtue of immortality; second, that *numen* is attendant upon godhood--that is, an effect, and not a cause, of divine status--and third, that *numen* is *not* attendant upon non-gods, and as such is not available to Lucretia.

The Sibyl, of course, would know. She is an authority on Roman religion by virtue of being a mouthpiece of the god Apollo, and Ovid's description of the Sibyl draws heavily on her history in the *Aeneid*.³⁴ The scene in Vergil's *Aeneid* in which the Sibyl's body is violently taken over by the divine spirit and speaks with an inhuman voice³⁵ is an image not easily forgotten. She spoke to Apollo on at least one occasion, as she relates in the *Metamorphoses*, and has learned precisely where the bounds between divinity and

Thus even if these events and connections *created* political capital for him by enhancing his reputation, it seems that he was not the one doing the creating.

³² *Met.* 14.132-3.

³³ Levene (2012) 62-3.

³⁴ For Ovid's versus Vergil's Sibyl, see Myers (1994) 102-4.

³⁵ *Aen.* 6.45-51.

humanity lie. She has extensive knowledge of the underworld, having served as a guide in that region, and having power (again, as memorably demonstrated in the *Aeneid*)³⁶ to open the underworld's gates and let herself through. In short, she is closer to and more knowledgeable about gods, both celestial and infernal, than most mortals could ever hope to be in the ancient world. If anyone is an authority on who can be worshipped as a god and how, she is. Nor is Aeneas so ignorant himself. In the *Aeneid* he has a number of memorable conversations with his mother Venus, either when she is disguised or not, and he as well has toured the underworld and gained wisdom from the dead. When these two converse on the nature of divinity in the *Metamorphoses*, it is safe to say, they know what religious obligation means, and no one is better qualified than *pius Aeneas* to perform religious functions properly. Her warning that he should not worship her *numen* should be taken seriously.

As a further point of interest, Ovid's Aeneas' use of the phrase *dea praesens* (quoted above) alludes to Vergil's *praesens divus* of *Eclogues* 1.41. By referring his readers to this earlier work of literature, Ovid connects Aeneas' gesture to Tityrus' elevation of the still-living Octavian to divinity, and in doing so implicitly questions the validity of divine honors offered to mortals by mortals. If Aeneas offers this ultimate mortal honor to the Sibyl, and she declines it as inappropriate to herself, she attacks the ability of mortals to accurately recognize which mortals in fact have extraordinary connections to the divine, and thereby questions Tityrus/Vergil's affirmation of the divinity of Octavian. In Ovid's world, where mortals are regularly borne up to Olympus by divine emissaries, where the Sibyl understands divinity and knows that she does not

³⁶ *Aen.* 6.255-61.

possess it, a grateful gesture, however heartfelt, offered by an ordinary mortal cannot compare to the grandeur of true apotheosis.

Examining Ovid's story of Lucretia from the angle of violence and supernatural transformation, one will notice that the violence is prominent, even exaggerated, compared to parallel accounts. The basic outline of Lucretia's story contains enough violence in its own right, even absent Ovid's intervention: her rape, laced with threats of bloodshed, and her subsequent suicide before witnesses certainly attach a sufficient amount of violence to her character. The element of supernatural transformation, on the other hand, is rather forced, as Brutus attempts to apotheose Lucretia on his own wherewithal, without divine sponsorship. It is noteworthy that Brutus invokes Lucretia's *numen* as the guarantor of his oath, and in doing so he lays tremendous significance upon his own statement that she is divine.³⁷ It appears as if Brutus is a reader of the *Fasti*, is aware that most apotheoses are preceded by intense violence, and is attempting to take the violent episode he witnessed and spin it into an apotheosis.

Ovid's Brutus, then, wants his action to be seen as a human-powered moment of divine transformation. Brutus takes Lucretia's misfortune so seriously that he wants to turn her into a foundation hero of the Republic, a martyr to his cause. His decision to transfigure Lucretia this way and invest her with *numen* on his own authority is a usurpation of divine prerogative to determine where *numen* is invested. Still, his process approaches the sort of deifications that will become common practice by the Roman Senate in the imperial age, well after Ovid's time. While the religious history and Ovid's

³⁷ In the onslaught of violence to Lucretia, few commentators take any notice of Brutus' oath, and none comment on the description of her *manes* as a *numen*. Bömer's (1958) only note on Brutus' oath is a syntactic point relating to the word order. While Robinson (2011) at least addresses the oath itself, he does not mention Lucretia as the guarantor of the oath.

literary treatment of the Sibyl seem to indicate that Brutus does not have the authority to promote Lucretia to divinity, he nevertheless speaks in a way that reveals that he believes he can, and moreover that he intends his contemporaries to act accordingly. More than a kingmaker, Brutus wants to be a godmaker, and this transgression invests a certain ominousness in his foundation of the Republic.

Calhoon persuasively describes Livy's Lucretia as a scapegoat figure, one who is sacrificed in effort to purge the sins of the rest of the community.³⁸ As Calhoon argues, Lucretia is by birth part of the community of Romans and an exemplar of its moral ideals, but her rape by Tarquinius contaminates her and alienates her from this community, transforming her into a suitable scapegoat. Her suicide serves to purge the community of evil by catalyzing the expulsion of the Tarquinii. Ovid's Lucretia succumbs to this model to an even greater degree. Even after her violation by Tarquinius, Livy's Lucretia maintains her stately bearing and undertakes her suicide with dignity; the reader can hardly see her as contaminated. Ovid's Lucretia, on the other hand, is consumed with shame at her violated status. She cannot bring herself to describe the rape, and the other characters have to drag the story out of her by prodding and guesswork. Her status as contaminated with sin and separated from chaste wives are evident in her manner, even as Brutus tries to rehabilitate her reputation by addressing her as a *numen*.

As Donaldson stresses, narratives of Lucretia's story, and the reception of the same, tend to take one of two approaches: either they stress Lucretia's experience and thereby eclipse the political repercussions, or they stress the political significance (which is to say, Brutus becomes the central character) and discard Lucretia's experience. In his sixth chapter, Donaldson discusses a sampling of later interpreters who subordinate the

³⁸ Calhoon (1997). For more on this subject, see Joplin (1990).

rape per se to its aftermath: “Machiavelli, for example, regarded the story of Lucretia’s rape rather light-heartedly, but found the political problems facing Brutus to be of absorbing interest. The rape itself (Machiavelli thought) was scarcely important, being merely the final event that triggered a revolution which had other and more serious causes. If Lucretia had not been raped, some other pretext for action would have been found.”³⁹ In this view, the intense, intimate violation of Lucretia is cast aside as trivial: suffering on this personal scale weighs little against the nation-level concerns of ones such as Tarquinius Superbus or Machiavelli. In contrast, Ovid’s narrative clearly privileges Lucretia’s story over Brutus’. Throughout the story, Lucretia is consistently foregrounded as important, whereas Brutus only steps in as a significant character in time to vow revenge--the revenge itself is elided. The reader can see that Lucretia is the focal character; only at the end does Brutus step in and attempt to reduce her to a symbol. It is counterintuitive that the moment when she begins to lose her agency and centrality as a character is the same moment when she is deified, yet this is characteristic of the Roman process of political deification, in which the deceased person, now deified, functions as a prop for a living politician.

With this in mind, the political significance of Lucretia in light of Ovid’s contemporary political situation still requires attention. As established above, in many ways Lucretia has no importance *aside from* her political significance; she is used as an icon of the republic rather than a person or character in her own right. Lucretia, of course, is a figure of perennial political symbolism in Rome, but as such she is heavily invested in the republic as an institution and distanced from the autocratic rule of the Caesars. Her suicide is emblematic of the injustices that could occur under unchecked autocratic rule.

³⁹ Donaldson (1982) 104.

There is an obvious disconnect, as is made clear by the discomfort of the historian Tacitus in writing about the recent past, between the idealized republic of which Lucretia was described as a champion, and the post-Caesarian republic that Augustus claimed to have “restored.” In light of their contemporary perception, I do not believe that even Ovid, in his desperation to be recalled by the ruling regime, would have had the audacity to identify Lucretia and Augustus as part of the same political movement.

The question also arises of the public or private nature of Sextus Tarquinius’ offense. In the historical pre-republican setting, the rape seems to have been understood as a private offense against Lucretia, her husband, and her family, rather than an offense that was committed in, and could be prosecuted in, the public sphere. In the Roman historians (most prominently Livy), the offense is treated as essentially private, for which reason I am also addressing the offense as private.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, there was a substantial shift in the legal interpretation of adultery, seduction, and rape in the Augustan age, on account of the *lex Iulia de adulteriis*. With the advent of this law, rape and adultery were re-interpreted as offenses against public morals and could be prosecuted by any Roman citizen, not just the interested parties.⁴¹ With this re-casting of any woman’s rape as the common concern of all Romans, one cannot help but hear echoes of this new public significance of the crime in Brutus’ decision to appropriate Lucretia’s private suffering as

⁴⁰ Dixon’s (2001) chapter on “Rape and Roman Law and Myth” addresses the evolving sense of rape as a public or private offense over the course of Roman history; Moses (1993) likewise addresses the rape of Livy’s Lucretia in the context of shifting legal attitudes toward coerced consent, and the reframing of adultery by the *lex Iulia de adulteriis*.

⁴¹ Severy (2003) makes an interesting reversal of this idea in her discussion of the *leges Iuliae*, stating that these laws “allowed the community to take over prosecution of an adulteress if her father or husband failed to do so, thus defining a man’s control of his female relatives as another of his civic duties” (Severy 51). In other words, not only has the community invaded the man’s bedroom, but the bedroom has also been integrated into the community. In this way, Brutus effectively becomes a balance on civic processes--when Collatinus fails in his duty of enforcing his wife’s chastity, Brutus steps in as surrogate enforcer *in his rights as a community member*.

an engine for revolution. If the public significance of a private offense seemed out of place to audiences who heard the story in Cicero's *de Re Publica* or other pre-Augustan histories, it certainly would have seemed less so to the audiences of Livy or Ovid who had been introduced to the idea of rape as a public offense. Yet the newness of this interpretation might retain some strangeness for the audience: those who had difficulty accepting the idea of rape as a public offense as defined in the *lex Iulia* might find Brutus' exploitation of Lucretia's tragedy equally dubious. By foregrounding (by means of Brutus' oath) the question of whether Lucretia's rape is a public or private offense, Ovid invites his readers to question the legitimacy of Brutus' enterprise and implicitly casts aspersions on the republic as a concept.

More important, though, in the integration of the Lucretia story to the Augustan milieu, is the role of Brutus. Robinson has already called attention to the prominence of Marcus Junius Brutus among the anti-Caesarian movement, and the fact that the Augustan-era Brutus was urged to follow the example of his ancestor.⁴² The existing identification between the Augustan-era Brutus and his tyrannicidal ancestor described by Ovid indicates that at the time, both Bruti were commonly identified as being similar representatives of an anti-monarchial movement. For this reason, Marcus Junius Brutus' hostility to Augustus creates an implicit identification between Ovid's Sextus Tarquinius and his contemporaries Caesar and Augustus. As Robinson implies,⁴³ Ovid may then have shied away from delving into the aftermath of Lucretia's suicide, as the dismantling

⁴² Robinson (2011) 463; Suet. *Div. Jul.* 80.3.

⁴³ "Ovid plays down the more obvious political aspects of the story [of Brutus], and so avoids some difficult issues...Ovid sidesteps any potentially awkward celebration of Brutus' deeds" (Robinson (2011) 463).

of the monarchy and the affirmation of the republic have some unfortunate anti-Augustan overtones.

Here I return to Brutus' use--what I am still declining to call "exploitation"--of Lucretia in his political program. When Ovid's Lucretia committed suicide, she may not have had any inkling of how her private sufferings and her response to the same would be interpreted, publicized, and adapted to political purposes after her death. Although Livy's Lucretia is conscious of setting a precedent for Roman women in general, Ovid's is constrained by her modesty into silence, and declines to register many of the opinions that are expressed by Livy's. Her purposes in committing suicide, and her desires for any political legacy, are opaque; indeed, as Lee points out, in contrast to the Livian Lucretia, the Ovidian Lucretia's last words do not look beyond her own fate,⁴⁴ and make no mention of what political repercussions she would like to provoke by her suicide. She does not have a political agenda or a sense of her legacy. Since she has said so little about her own wishes, it is most unfortunate that the events of her personal life should be so heavily used as political currency by Brutus after her death: the reader hears everything that she tells Brutus about the events, and we have (and thus he has) no indication that she would want her life used in a political maneuver. It is distressing that her own silence has been twisted into an implicit consent to Brutus' political program, that her failure or refusal to speak in life has been assigned another meaning to suit someone else's political purposes. And of course, now dead, she has no opportunity to object to Brutus' program.

Within the *Fasti*, Lucretia is provided with a narrative of which she is the heroine. The story arc is very strongly modeled on Livy's, although it bears a number of noteworthy Ovidian touches (such as the weakening of Lucretia's character from an

⁴⁴ Lee (1953) 116.

irreproachable Roman matron to a vulnerable young woman), commonly explained as necessary concessions to the conventions of elegiac poetry. Lucretia's narrative, in the grand Lucretia tradition, does include a great deal of violence suffered by this young matron, including Sextus' threats to end her life and destroy her reputation, which threats were averted only by her submission to rape and closely followed by her suicide. Within the context of the *Fasti* and its established correlation between violence and apotheosis, the reader might expect Lucretia's apotheosis to follow. In this light, it is not surprising that Brutus vows over her corpse that Lucretia's *manes* will afterward be a *numen* for him, and that he uses this *numen* to guarantee his vow to destroy the Tarquinius. Here, in essence, he attempts to compel Lucretia's apotheosis as a consequence of the violence she suffered, following the rape model established in chapter three. Truly the reader witnesses Brutus following the same process as the narrator of the *Fasti* does: Brutus witnesses an act of violence perpetrated against someone, and he uses that violent act as a springboard to describe that person in divine terms, as if as compensation for their suffering. Nevertheless, Brutus is not the narrator of the *Fasti*, and within the narrative he does not have the narrative power to effect someone's apotheosis by verbal affirmation. Alas for Brutus, alas for Lucretia, all of the characters in this narrative are mortal. Lucretia was not raped by a god (unlike Carina or Persephone) and so cannot be rewarded with deification as a compensatory gift; Brutus is not a god (like Numicius intervening on Anna's behalf) who can rescue Lucretia from an imminent threat. In essence, Lucretia's story functions to define the limits of the correlation between violence and transformation in this work. Although she suffers violence, and does so at a junction crucial to Roman history, the violence she suffers attracts no divine involvement and for that reason does

not attract any elements of extraordinary transformation. She may be revered by Brutus, but the gods do not grant her absolute divinity.

Livia

In the *Fasti*, Ovid refers to Livia as a goddess, despite the fact that Livia was not at the time recognized as a goddess by the Roman state: she would eventually be formally deified, but not until many years after her death, and Ovid would in fact predecease her. Many scholars are content to skim over or brush aside this reference as an extension of Augustus' position, as an embellishment upon the religious honors that were already conferred upon her, or as mere flattery from an exile desperate to obtain from this patroness a recall. On the contrary, I would claim that none of these explanations sufficiently explain Ovid's motivation to describe Livia in such an extravagant manner. This choice, I insist, has definite literary significance in relation to other works of Augustan poetry, as well as practical meaning in religious terms. In particular it grants her status independent of that of her husband and son. To illustrate these points, one must compare the representation of Livia in the *Fasti* (and other works of Ovid) with the apotheoses of other women in the *Fasti*, and in the other works of Ovid.

Although the importance of the deifications of Julio-Claudians in Roman religion has been discussed at considerable length by other authors,⁴⁵ my dissertation is concerned less with the meaning of these deifications in cult and more with their literary meaning. As has been established by a number of authors, Augustan poets took an experimental approach to the literary representation of the religious position of Octavian, just as

⁴⁵ Gradel (2002), Levene (2012), Beard, North, and Price (1998), Pandey (2013).

Octavian himself took an experimental approach to his own role in religious practices. Feeney addresses issues of representation in and reception of poetry at length, noting the “chronological transformations of Augustan ideology” and stating that “If Augustan ideological programmes in art and architecture were constantly evolving over time, we must also acknowledge that, at any given moment in his career, Augustus was a force which could not be pinned down by description...Ovid’s *Fasti* in particular, as we shall see, is acutely aware of the fact that what Augustus represented was a dynamic.”⁴⁶ What Octavian/Augustus *was*, on the fine gradation between man and god, was a question long debated, and was not well settled until after his death.⁴⁷ While Augustus experimented with different titles for himself, and different ways that his subjects might envision his divinity--by worshipping either his *genius*, or the emperor himself--his sponsored poets experimented just as much with the ways he was represented in their poetry, up to and after his death.⁴⁸

This is even more true for Livia, also known (after Augustus’ death) as Julia Augusta. Livia’s role in the poetry of Ovid has attracted a small amount of scholarly attention. This *mater patriae* was of great political significance and influence during Ovid’s later career, and was someone whom Ovid could and did petition for recall from his exile. Her significance has been addressed in detail by Gertrude Grether in 1946,

⁴⁶ Feeney (1992) 1-2.

⁴⁷ Gradel (2002).

⁴⁸ Mynors (1990) 1 presents the Octavian of Vergil’s *Georgics* as a “hero” rather than a fully-realized god. He attests to the experimental nature of Octavian’s representation when he says of the proem of the *Georgics* that it “may read like a prayer, but it is not a prayer; some of the deities are not even properly named, some have no regular cult. But it provides V[irgil] with a new means of declaring his enthusiasm for Octavian, the heir of Divus Iulius, for whose position in Rome...there was as yet no standard form of words” (Mynors 2).

Geraldine Herbert-Brown in 1994, and Patricia Johnson in 1997.⁴⁹ Livia is referenced four times in the *Fasti*,⁵⁰ and her divine status is clear in those references. The first reference comes in a prophecy by Carmentis about the future of Italy:

*et penes Augustos patriae tutela manebit:
hanc fas imperii frena tenere domum.
inde nepos natusque dei, licet ipse recuset,
pondera caelesti mente paterna feret;
utque ego perpetuis olim sacrabor in aris,
sic Augusta novum Julia nomen erit.*

And the protection of the country will remain in the care of the Augusti; it is right for this house to hold the reins of the Roman state. From that point on the son and the grandson of the god [Divus Iulius] will bear their inherited burden with a godlike mindset, even though they themselves will not seek power. And just as I will someday be honored at perpetual altars, thus Julia Augusta [Livia] will be a new *numen*.⁵¹

In this passage, the reader finds a prophecy in the distant past referring to the future deification of Livia, that is, Julia Augusta. One may read this as an optimistic assessment, on Ovid's part, of the likelihood that Livia would be deified, as indeed she eventually was; such a reference need not carry any particular meaning for the reality of Ovid's lifetime. The transformative reference, on the contrary, appears at 1.650, when Ovid (addressing Tiberius) says of Livia, *sola toro magni digna reperta Jovis*, "She alone was found worthy of the bed of great Jupiter [i.e. Augustus]." Here Livia has been, through the power of metaphor, elevated to the position of Juno. In fact, Livia's deification is no longer presented as a wish for the future, but as a fact for the present--and Ovid is the first author to dare to make this claim. It puts her in a position from which historical

⁴⁹ Luisi and Berrino (2010) touch on Ovid's references to Livia in the *Fasti*, but they focus on the exilic poetry in which references to Livia are more abundant. Jenkins' (2009) article addresses the language and characterization applied to Livia in the pseudo-Ovidian *Consolatio ad Liviam*, which provides a useful point of comparison for Ovidian literature. Barrett's (2002) biography of Livia is also a useful resource.

⁵⁰ 1.533-6, 1.649-50, 5.155-8, 6.637-48.

⁵¹ *Fasti* 1.531-6.

women are otherwise excluded in the works of Ovid. She is, as Ovid states, *sola*, the *only* woman found worthy of Jupiter's bed.⁵²

In referring to Livia as a goddess and the bedmate of "Jupiter," Ovid is setting himself apart from his contemporaries. Livia would not be formally deified for state purposes until Claudius ascended, and indeed, Livia outlived Ovid by a decade, which explains why the *Fasti* includes no narrative of her apotheosis (since the Roman understanding of deification was inextricably bound to the departure from the mortal world via death, see above). Livia is certainly not dead when Ovid writes of her, and yet, in Hellenistic style, Ovid nevertheless refers to her as a goddess. Although the original effect may have been intended to be reverent, Ovid is always a difficult poet to pin down with regard to his degrees of sincerity, and any intended reverence is necessarily undermined by suspicions of sarcasm and a search for unflattering meanings. In Ovid's ardent wish to gain recall from exile, any reference to Livia might have been perilously fraught with suspicion, and it is quite understandable that Ovid for the most part pursues a strategy of silence, mentioning Livia only four times throughout the course of the *Fasti*.

In that light, Ovid's decision to portray Livia as divine is a decided departure from contemporary convention. In the years after her death, Livia is discussed by Suetonius, Tacitus, and Dio; indeed, she is portrayed as an important figure in the Augustan government. Nevertheless, during her lifetime, Livia appears in literature only infrequently and late. As Green stresses in his commentary on *Fasti* 1,⁵³ prior to the *Fasti*, she is only mentioned in poetry once (and not by name), in Horace's *Carmina*

⁵² In fact, Livia had divorced another husband to marry Augustus, and was Augustus' third wife. On Ovid's decision to contradict the publicly known fact that Augustus had married before, see Green's commentary (2004) 298-9, Newlands (1995) 44-5.

⁵³ Green's commentary (2004) 236. Cf. Severy (2003) 234.

3.14.5-6. Most other authors of the same period chose not to mention Livia at all, or only in the most detached, abstract sense. Ovid's earliest reference to Livia, at *Met.* 15.836, follows the Horatian model of mentioning Livia only in passing, in a context firmly grounded in her relationship to her male family members, and not by name: [*Augustus*] *prospiciens prolem sancta de conjuge natam/ferre simul nomenque suum curasque jubebit...* "[Augustus] looking forward will command his son, born from his *sancta* spouse, to carry forth both his legacy and his concerns at once..." In Ovid's later references to Livia he would grow more specific, give the *conjunx* a name and identify her in terms of acts she had accomplished and petitions she could answer rather than simply through relational terms to her male relatives.⁵⁴

Susan Wood has completed a nuanced study of Livia's role in the Augustan government and how her political role was received by the public.⁵⁵ Wood concludes that Livia's public role was somewhat low-key to avoid unflattering comparisons to the notorious queen Cleopatra, but in spite of that potential the role she did have was not disguised. Indeed, Wood judges that Livia's political influence was known throughout the empire, and that she was in fact popular as a political figure: "[Livia] seems to have enjoyed the genuine affection of many people and provincial cities throughout the empire, many of which bestowed honors on her that had not yet received official

⁵⁴ Jenkins (2009) discusses the *Consolatio ad Liviam* as a clear departure from this tradition of circumlocution, insofar as Livia is there presented as a primary agent in the narrative; in the *Consolatio*, the narrator struggles to portray Livia as politically powerful without implying that this power is indecorous for a woman. Unfortunately, as the poem cannot be confidently dated, its role within the Augustan poets' evolving discussion of Livia cannot be established.

⁵⁵ Wood (1999) is substantially concerned with Livia's public image, especially in portraiture. For further on Livia's portraiture, see Bartman (1999) and Winkes (1995).

sanction.”⁵⁶ Considering that the earlier Augustan poets, such as Horace and Vergil, were associated very closely with the palace, they must have been aware of the importance of a personage such as Livia. Still, the authors of her time were apparently reluctant to discuss her in literature. The reasons behind this trend are likely multiple and complicated, but the primary reason behind Livia’s lack of visibility, I would argue, is a result of a sort of reactionary modesty that was current at the time. As has been amply demonstrated by Severy, the early principate was a time when the concepts of family, marriage, and filiation substantially changed in Roman culture, and Augustus’ household was at the center of that revolution: suddenly, one family was essential to the state, and the state held more sway in every family. The power of Augustus to rule effectively was reflected in his ability to control his household, and to make his family demonstrate esteemed Roman virtues. Livia stood as an exemplar for the matrons of Rome, and as such, made a virtue of not being publicly prominent.

Even so, it seems clear from the exilic poems of Ovid that, no later than the death of Augustus, Livia was a person of authority in Rome, someone taken on level with Tiberius,⁵⁷ to whom petitions could be addressed.⁵⁸ She is given a presence in the religious life of the city (building the shrine to Concordia or the Porticus Liviae), but her

⁵⁶ Wood (1999) 75. Wood 86-7 argues that the hostile biographical tradition against Livia (exemplified by the works of Tacitus) was in fact a revisionist reaction against “a woman whose public image as the ideal wife and mother many people had enthusiastically accepted both during and after her lifetime.”

⁵⁷ In his commentary on *Fasti* 1, Green (2004) 236-7 remarks, regarding the granting of the title Augusta to Livia in Augustus’ will, “As there was no Roman precedent for a male title conferred on a woman, and because Augustus left no specific instructions as to its significance, there was much debate as to whether the title was intended to be purely honorary or one which carried with it formal constitutional power. Both the Senate and Livia believed it to be the latter...Livia herself believed that she was entitled to constitutional power which was at least equal to her son’s.”

⁵⁸ Wood (1999) 77-80.

role within it is not elaborated.⁵⁹ Conforming to the conventions of an honorable Roman wife, Livia is little seen in public and exerts influence only in a private family environment--as is, in fact, borne out by contemporary descriptions of her. Ovid runs contrary to these conventions by drawing her into his poems, in contrast to all his contemporaries and, apparently, to the displeasure of the regime. She appears infrequently, and is never a character in a story, only a personage important for religious purposes: as the founder of a shrine, or as a silver image sent to Ovid in Tomi.⁶⁰

Livia's transition to the divine level is occasioned by no tragedy, not even her death, since she outlived Ovid by a great margin. On the contrary, her deification is triumphant. Ovid attributes no suffering to her, and grants her *numen* while she is still on earth to take advantage of it. She is given the opportunity to exercise this *numen* in her own right (just as she was granted special dispensation by the senate to control property in her own name, without the care of a guardian). In structural terms, she does not fit the normal model of having to pay the price of suffering in exchange for the honor of divinity. Like Augustus', her divinity is declared simply and painlessly, as Ovid's gesture of confidence toward her.⁶¹

Although other poets avoided mention of Livia for the sake of her *pudicitia*, I believe that Ovid's decision to cast off this convention was in fact an attempt to flatter her in his depiction of her as a goddess. Ovid's experimental approach to the depiction of

⁵⁹ For the treatment of monuments and the Augustan building program within the *Fasti*, and in particular Ovid's failure to live up to his promise to extol the monuments of the Caesars, see Green's 2004 article.

⁶⁰ In *Ex Ponto* 2.8, Ovid describes receiving a set of silver images of Augustus, Tiberius, and Livia, and he thanks Cotta for sending these *deos*. These images are conventionally read as "silver statuettes" intended for cult worship (see Syme (1978) 127). McGowan (2009) 70n31 concurs with Clauss (1999) 304 in speculating that the silver images are actually coins or medallions.

⁶¹ When the Augustan poets discuss Augustus' divinity, they generally do so couched in future terms, implying that the apotheosis is contingent upon Augustus' death (consider the proem of the *Georgics*, e.g., or the finale of the *Metamorphoses*). But cf. *Eclogues* 1, in which Tityrus refers to Octavian (although anonymously) as a god in the present.

Livia in his poetry is entirely consistent with the testing that Ovid and other poets had conducted in earlier years with the literary depiction of Augustus (see above).⁶² To this end, the cautiously-attempted literary depiction of Livia is essentially the next step in the literary depiction of Augustus: the exaltation of Livia draws a favorable parallel to Hersilie/Hora. Unfortunately for him, his experiment in literary praise (carefully calculated as it was) seems to have failed: Livia was not flattered enough by his portrayals to recall him from Tomi.⁶³

The progression of this experimental approach is easy to track: Ovid grew bolder over time in his references to Livia. In his first reference to her, she is only a nameless *conjunx*, defined by reference to her husband and son. She undertakes no action plays no role in any events: she is only important as an idea, a guarantee that Augustus has a healthy family life, but not as an individual. In later references, in the *Fasti*, she is more active: she is referenced as the sponsor of public works, a benefactress of Rome. One must mark, however, that even though she is identified as the force behind these works, the poem does not in fact depict her creating them. Though she has an important role, the reader does not *see* her in this role, and once again, the idea of her as a benefactress may be more important than the actions she undertook that made her a benefactress. It is not until a still later work, the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, that Livia becomes visible to Ovid's reader, when she is described as a silver image that Ovid is able to admire. This visibility

⁶² Galinsky (1996) 234-7 stresses the tendency toward experimentation in Ovid's works and in Augustan poetry in general: "Like Augustan art and statecraft, Augustan poetry drew on republican traditions and took them in new directions. The tradition of experimentation did not merely continue but reached new heights...Wherever we look in Ovid's oeuvre, we find experimentation: nobody had ventured to put the Roman religious calendar into elegaic verse, as he did in the *Fasti*." In his analysis of Augustan culture, experimentation is given as one of the defining facets of the literary world.

⁶³ Galinsky (1996) addresses this point by criticizing the "inadequate top-down conception of the Augustan reign" and saying that "Few scholars today would still maintain that the poets were simply mouthpieces of the government" (Galinsky 244).

in the poem marks an important turning-point in Ovid's approach to Livia.⁶⁴ Here she is no longer being cloistered away from the reader as a retiring matron; she is placed before the eyes of the author, and the eyes of the reader, as someone to revere. At this point in Ovid's poetry, Livia has effectively been transformed into something not a matron: she no longer needs to be shielded from public view. In Ovid's works, she is not only a public figure, but moreover a goddess.

Although Livia is not given a narrative of deification in the *Fasti*, she is depicted as divine well before she was formally recognized so by the state. This claim of Livia's divinity was a tentative, experimental attempt at flattery on Ovid's part, a move to ingratiate himself to a power figure in attempt to be recalled from exile. Nevertheless, this attempt was not successful, and Ovid was forced to remain in exile for the rest of his life. Ovid here engages the same process as Brutus does later in the *Fasti*: he attempts to assert the divinity of a mortal for reasons of political expedience. Nevertheless, as shown in the *Fasti*, the matter of absolute divinity rests with the gods, and regardless of what honors mortals confer, only sponsorship from a god will effect true apotheosis. Livia here may be exalted by mortals, but such exaltation does not affect her status among the Olympians.

⁶⁴ *Ex Ponto* 2.8.1-6, 9-10, 13-5. These lines are heavy on the language of seeing and watching, as Ovid observes images of the ruling triad and reflects on his wish to see them in person again, in Rome. The remainder of the poem also leans heavily on language of seeing and watching, as Ovid imagines a return to Rome and all the things he would be able to see in person again.